

# Appendix A

## Performance Data Tables

## APPENDIX A: PERFORMANCE DATA TABLES

### Key to Tables in Appendix A

M = Million  
 PP = Percentage points  
 FY = Fiscal Year  
 SY = School Year  
 NCLB = No Child Left Behind Act  
 ESEA = Elementary and Secondary Education Act

Tables generally contain data for 2000–04 to the extent that measures were in place for those years.

Bolded entries represent data not previously reported in an annual performance report.

### Key to Documentation in Appendix A

**Source.** Identifies the original source(s) of the data provided in the corresponding table.

**Data Quality.** Includes information such as how data were collected, calculated, and reviewed; data strengths and limitations; and plans for improvement of data quality.

**Target Context.** Explains the rationale for targets.

**Related Information.** Identifies the location of supplementary information about the topic addressed by the performance measure(s).

**Additional Information.** Provides relevant background about a measure. Also provides an explanation for unmet targets and actions being taken or planned to address the shortfall. Where data are not yet available, the section provides the date by which data are expected to be available.

### OBJECTIVE 1.1: LINK FEDERAL FUNDING TO ACCOUNTABILITY FOR RESULTS

**1.1.1** Percentage of states with final No Child Left Behind accountability systems (as required by SY 2005–06) that are fully implemented

Fiscal Year	Actual
2003	<b>21</b> (est)
2004	<b>23</b> (est)
We exceeded our 2004 target of 15.	

States = States and jurisdictions that are required under No Child Left Behind to implement assessments systems; this includes the 50 states, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico.

est = estimated, preliminary, or partial data

This measure was first established for FY 2004.

**Source.** Department of Education, Consolidated State Performance Reports and Consolidated State Applications, 2002–03.

**Data Quality.** Department of Education staff review Consolidated State Applications and Consolidated State Performance Reports submitted by state educational agencies (SEAs). States must submit data to substantiate the implementation of their accountability systems.

An implemented accountability system must include:

Standards-based assessments in reading/language arts in each of grades 3–8 and once at the high school level.

Standards-based assessments in mathematics in each of grades 3–8 and once at the high school level.

An approved accountability plan under No Child Left Behind.

Data are reported as estimated because assessment systems for these states have not yet been approved by the Department.

**Target Context.** A target of 15 percent of states having systems in place two years ahead of the required schedule was considered ambitious.

**Related Information.** Final regulations for No Child Left Behind state accountability systems are available at <http://www.ed.gov/policy/landing.jhtml>.

**Additional Information.** The 12 states with implemented assessments and accountability systems under No Child Left Behind in SY 2003–04 were California, Florida, Georgia, Maryland, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, and West Virginia.

Under No Child Left Behind, states are required beginning with SY 2005–06 to administer standards-based assessments in both reading/language arts and mathematics in each of grades 3–8 and at the high school level. During school years 2002–03, 2003–04, and 2004–05, states must administer reading/language arts and mathematics assessments at least once in grades 3–5, at least once in grades 6–9, and at least once in grades 10–12.

### OBJECTIVE 1.2: FLEXIBILITY AND LOCAL CONTROL

**1.2.1** Percentage of school districts using Local-Flex, Transferability, or Rural Flexibility

Fiscal Year	Local-Flex	Transferability	Rural Flexibility
2003		<b>12.5</b>	<b>61</b>
2004	<b>1.2</b>	Target is 22.5.	Target is 71.
	We set a baseline in 2004.	We set a baseline in 2003. Data for 2004 are pending.	We set a baseline in 2003. Data for 2004 are pending.

The measure for Local-Flex was first established for FY 2004. Measures for Transferability and Rural Flexibility were first established for FY 2003.

**Source.** Department of Education, Office of Elementary and Secondary Education, Consolidated State Performance Reports, annual submissions.

**Data Quality.** Department of Education staff reviewed Consolidated State Performance Reports submitted by state educational agencies in summer 2004 for SY 2002–03. Data are validated against internal review procedures. The percentage of school districts using Local-Flex, Transferability, or Rural Flexibility provide an unduplicated count of districts because the Department does not believe that a school district would use more than one of these initiatives at the same time.

Each of the three program authorities has a different number of potentially eligible local educational agency (LEA) participants.

The Local-Flex statute authorizes up to 80 eligible LEAs; there were no participants in SY 2002–03 and only one participant in SY 2003–04.

Fifty states reported that a total 1,857 of 14,859 LEAs used their Transferability authority during SY 2002–03. Two states have not reported Transferability counts as of September 2004.

During SY 2002–03, 2,904 of 4,763 eligible LEAs notified states of their intention to use the Alternative Uses of Funds Authority under the Rural Education Achievement Program—Small, Rural School Achievement (REAP-SRSA). REAP-SRSA data are based on reports from 49 states as of August 2004; remaining states have been given extensions to submit these data.

**Target Context.** For Transferability and Rural-Flexibility, FY 2003 was a baseline year; targets for FY 2004 were set at 10 percentage points above the baseline. FY 2004 was the baseline year for Local-Flex.

**Related Information.** More information on flexibility programs is available at <http://www.ed.gov/nclb/freedom/local/flexibility/index.html>.

More information on the Rural Education Achievement Program is available at <http://www.ed.gov/programs/reapsrsa/index.html>.

**Additional Information.** Data for 2004 for Transferability and REAP will be available in April 2005.

These measures are based on the provisions for the Local Flexibility Demonstration Program (Local-Flex), Local Transferability, and REAP-SRSA.

The Local-Flex program allows local school districts to consolidate formula funds under the following programs: Improving Teacher Quality State Grants, Educational Technology, Innovative Programs, and Safe and Drug-Free Schools. It was authorized under No Child Left Behind and was available for SY 2002–03. The baseline year for data is SY 2003–04. The first recipient was approved in December 2003.

The Transferability Authority gives authority to states and districts to transfer up to 50 percent of the funds they receive by formula under certain programs to state and local activities most likely to improve student achievement. It was authorized under No Child Left Behind and was available to districts starting with SY 2002–03. (The Department published guidance for this activity in fall 2002.) The baseline year for this activity was SY 2002–03.

The Alternative Uses of Funds Authority under REAP allows eligible local educational agencies the authority to combine funding under certain federal programs to carry out local activities under other specified federal programs. It first operated under No Child Left Behind provisions in SY 2002–03, although it existed for a year under previous legislation. The Department initially collected data for SY 2002–03, when regulations under No Child Left Behind were fully implemented.

1.2.2 Number of states receiving State-Flex authority (statutory maximum of 7)	
Fiscal Year	Actual
2003	0
2004	0
We did not meet our 2004 target of 3.	

This measure was first established for FY 2004.

**Source.** Department of Education, Office of Elementary and Secondary Education, Consolidated State Performance Reports, annual submissions.

**Data Quality.** The Department entered into its first State-Flex agreement during SY 2003–04. However, the one state that received State-Flex authority withdrew from the program in summer 2004. At present there are no states with State-Flex authority.

**Related Information.** Information on State-Flex is available at <http://www.ed.gov/programs/stateflex/index.html>.

**Additional Information.** State-Flex permits states to make the best use of federal funds by consolidating certain formula funds (other than Title I) if doing so will help the state raise student achievement. There is no specific application deadline for this authority. Applications are accepted on a rolling basis as received until the maximum number of State-Flex proposals authorized by the statute—seven—has been approved. The Department published a Federal Register Notice in March 2004 inviting states to apply for State-Flex at their convenience.

1.2.3 Percentage of LEAs with authority under State-Flex that make AYP	
Fiscal Year	Actual
2004	<b>Not Applicable</b>
This measure was not applicable for 2004 because no states had State-Flex authority.	

LEAs = Local Educational Agencies

This measure was first established for FY 2004.

**Source.** Department of Education, Office of Elementary and Secondary Education, State-Flex Program Office, program files.

**Data Quality.** Approval of this authority is contingent upon a state receiving State-Flex authority. At present there are no states with State-Flex authority; therefore the baseline could not be established.

**Target Context.** When new states apply and receive State-Flex authority, the Department will establish a baseline and targets.

**Related Information.** More information on flexibility programs is available at <http://www.ed.gov/nclb/freedom/local/local.html>.

Additional information about what happens when a school fails to make adequate yearly progress is available at <http://www.ed.gov/nclb/overview/welcome/closing/edlite-slide026.html>.

1.2.4 Percentage of Department grantees that express satisfaction with Department customer service	
Fiscal Year	Actual
2002	63
2003	68
2004	Target is 67.
Data for 2004 are pending.	

**Source.** Department of Education, Survey on Satisfaction of Chief State School Officers, 2002.

Department of Education, Survey on Satisfaction with the U.S. Department of Education, 2003.

Department of Education, Customer Satisfaction Measurement and Improvement System, 2004.

**Data Quality.** The Department collected data for this measure from a questionnaire distributed to 52 state education leaders in FY 2002 and 312 state education leaders in FY 2003. The questionnaire asked about satisfaction with customer service, technical assistance, Web utilization, and documentation. The survey was developed and results were tabulated and processed by a contractor with expertise in survey development and analysis.

The FY 2004 survey will collect data through a revised questionnaire that retains some of the previous survey's questions to allow for trending. The revised questionnaire improves the previous questionnaire by

allowing the Department to identify impact levels for each customer service component so that we can remediate service delivery in those areas of greatest impact. The revised survey was developed and conducted by a contractor with expertise in survey design and development.

**Target Context.** A performance baseline of 63 was set from the results of the 2002 survey data. The 2003 and 2004 targets were set based on expected progress in satisfying our customers.

**Additional Information.** Because the Department chose to revise its questionnaire for the FY 2004 survey, collection of customer satisfaction data for FY 2004 was delayed briefly. Results of the 2004 survey will be available December 2004.

### OBJECTIVE 1.3: INFORMATION AND OPTIONS FOR PARENTS

1.3.1 Percentage of students in grades K–12 who are attending a school (public or private) that their parents have chosen	
Fiscal Year	Actual
1999	26
2001*	26
2003	<b>27</b>
2004	<b>Not collected</b>
We exceeded our 2003 target of 19. We did not collect data for 2004 because it is an off-year for both collections.	

\* K–8

**Source.** Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, National Household Education Surveys Program, Parent Survey, 2003.

Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, National Household Education Surveys Program, Before- and After-School Programs and Activities Survey, 1999 and 2001.

Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, National Household Education Surveys Program, Parent and Family Involvement in Education Survey, 2003.

**Data Quality.** The National Household Education Survey is a national random-digit-dialed telephone data collection program sponsored by the National Center for Education Statistics. When properly weighted, the data are representative of all civilian, noninstitutionalized persons in the United States. The weighted response rate for the Parent Survey, 1999, was 65 percent. The weighted response rate for the Before- and After-School Programs and Activities Survey, 2001, was 60 percent. The weighted response rate for the Parent and Family Involvement in Education Survey, 2003, was 54 percent.

Data for 2001 are only for K–8, not the specified K–12 population of the current measure. K–12 data will be collected every four years. No data collection was conducted in 2004. The next planned K–8 data collection is 2005, and those estimates will be available in 2006. Data to update the K–12 estimates will be collected in 2007 and will be available in 2008.

**Target Context.** School choice is a school reform initiative that, since the 1980s, has moved from a theoretical argument for changes in the public education system to a widespread reform movement (U.S. Department of Education, 1995; Cookson, 1994). Within the United States, school choice primarily comprises programs that allow students to attend any public school within or outside of their local school district, a magnet or charter school, a private school, or home-school. Before the late 1980s, school choice was almost synonymous with private school attendance (Choy, 1997). However, the availability of public school choice, which generally includes magnet and charter schools and inter- and intradistrict school choice, has grown. The number of magnet schools nearly doubled since between the early 1980s and the year 2000, and the number of public charter schools grew from two schools in 1992 to over 1,400 schools in 1999 (Nelson, et al., 2000; Algozzine et al., 1999).

**Related Information.** The National Household Education Survey Web site is <http://nces.ed.gov/nhes/>.

Information on the Parent Survey, 1999, is available at [http://nces.ed.gov/nhes/surveytopics\\_school.asp](http://nces.ed.gov/nhes/surveytopics_school.asp).

Information about the Before- and After-School Programs and Activities Survey, 2001, is available at [http://nces.ed.gov/nhes/surveytopics\\_school.asp](http://nces.ed.gov/nhes/surveytopics_school.asp).

Information about the Parent and Family Involvement Survey, 2003, is available at [http://nces.ed.gov/nhes/surveytopics\\_school.asp](http://nces.ed.gov/nhes/surveytopics_school.asp).

Additional information on parental choice is available at <http://www.ed.gov/parents/schools/choice/edpicks.jhtml?src=qc>.

In addition to magnet schools and charter schools, the Voluntary Public School Choice program, a discretionary program, supports states and school districts in efforts to establish or expand a public school choice program. More information is available at <http://www.ed.gov/programs/choice/index.html>.

1.3.2 Number of children attending charter schools	
Fiscal Year	Actual
1999	252,000
2000	478,000
2001	546,000
2002	575,000
2003	684,000
2004	<b>698,000</b>
We made progress toward our 2004 target of 800,000.	

**Source.** Center for Education Reform, *National Charter School Directory 2002–2004* (2002, 2003, and 2004 data).

Department of Education, program files (2000 and 2001 data).

Department of Education, *State of Charter Schools 2000: Fourth-Year Report* (1999 data).

**Data Quality.** Initially, the Department collected charter school enrollment data through a four-year national study of charter schools. The 1999 data were taken from the last such study as reported in *State of Charter Schools 2000: Fourth-Year Report*. For FY 2000 and FY 2001, the Department used data that were collected, validated, and reported by the states. States have varying methods for collection and varying standards for defining charter schools and enrollment.

FY 2002, 2003, and 2004 data were provided by the Center for Education Reform, which collected data by a telephone survey using methods similar to those used by the Department in FY 2000 and 2001. The Center for Education Reform counts enrollment at the beginning of each school year. FY 2004 data for this measure are taken from the Center for Education Reform's statistics for SY 2003–04. SY 2003–04 data are used because they measure actual enrollment in FY 2004, which covers October 2003 to September 2004. The Center published updated enrollment statistics for SY 2003–04 in January 2004.

**Target Context.** The Department modified the 2004 target in December 2003 because of the slower-than-anticipated growth of new charter schools and because states with caps on the number of charter schools have not revised their charter school statutes that govern establishment of new charter schools.

The growth in the number of children enrolled in charter schools and the number of new charter schools has continued over the last five years, although not as dramatically as in the early days of the charter school movement. This trend is largely dependent on state legislatures, which maintain authority to pass laws authorizing the creation and regulation of charter schools. Few states have enacted charter school legislation in recent years. Although some states have successfully amended their state statutes to either

increase or remove the cap on the number of charter schools, other states have not been as successful. In states where the number of charter schools has reached or is approaching the cap, enrollment has slowed or leveled off. In states and cities where there are large numbers of charter schools, it has become increasingly difficult for charter school developers to secure adequate facilities.

**Related Information.** The Center for Education Reform's statistics and highlights page makes current-year enrollment figures available at <http://www.edreform.com/index.cfm?fuseAction=stateStatChart&psectionid=15&cSectionID=44>.

The Department sponsors an independent Web site that provides information about charter schools. It is available at <http://www.uscharterschools.org/>.

The NCES Common Core of Data collects information on charter schools as part of its Public School Universe data collection. Information on the Common Core of Data is available at <http://nces.ed.gov/ccd/>.

The *State of Charter Schools 2000: Fourth Year Report* is available at <http://www.ed.gov/pubs/charter4thyear/>.

**Additional Information.** The Department continues to employ a number of information-sharing strategies to assist states in furthering their charter school efforts, including providing testimony by Department staff to state legislatures, providing information to state charter school organizations, and inviting state legislators to attend the Department's Annual Charter School Conference. In addition, the President's 2005 budget request included a substantial increase in funds for the Credit Enhancement for Charter Schools Facilities Program, which provides funds on a competitive basis to public and nonprofit entities, and consortia of those entities, to leverage other funds and help charter schools obtain school facilities through such means as purchase, lease, and donation. Grantees may also use grants to leverage funds to help charter schools construct and renovate school facilities.

1.3.3 Of eligible children, the percentage using supplemental educational services under the provisions of ESEA Title I	
Fiscal Year	Actual
2003	Target is to set a baseline.
2004	Target is baseline + 5 PP.
Data for 2003 and 2004 are pending.	

ESEA = Elementary and Secondary Education Act

**Source.** *Evaluation of Title I Accountability and School Improvement Efforts (TASSIE): Second Year Findings.*

**Data Quality.** The number of all students eligible for services may be underestimated because 45 percent of districts required to offer supplemental services reported they did not have schools required to provide

supplemental services and did not provide any data on numbers of students. The estimates of the number of students who received services are based on the 48 percent of districts with schools required to offer supplemental services and that provided supplemental services to students in identified Title I schools. For additional information regarding the limitations of the data, see *Evaluation of Title I Accountability and School Improvement Efforts (TASSIE): Second Year Findings* at <http://www.ed.gov/ods/ppss/reports.html#title>.

The formula for determining the percentage of students is the approximate number of students who received supplemental services from an approved supplemental services provider in SY 2002–03 divided by the number of students eligible to receive supplemental services in SY 2002–03, including students in all districts with Title I schools identified for two or more years that reported they had Title I schools required to offer supplemental services to students, regardless of whether or not the district offered supplemental services.

Eligible children are children from low-income families who attend a school in its second year of “school improvement” status under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. Provisions for supplemental services under Title I went into effect September 2002 for SY 2002–03.

**Related Information.** TASSIE reports are available at [www.ed.gov/ods/ppss/reports.html#title](http://www.ed.gov/ods/ppss/reports.html#title). Additional information on TASSIE is also available at [www.tassieonline.org](http://www.tassieonline.org).

Information on supplemental services is available at <http://www.ed.gov/about/offices/list/oi/about/choice.html>.

**Additional Information.** Data for 2003 will be available at the end of November 2004. Data for 2004 will be available in October 2005.

#### OBJECTIVE 1.4: USE OF SCIENTIFICALLY BASED METHODS WITHIN FEDERAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS

1.4.1 Number of hits on the What Works Clearinghouse Web site	
Fiscal Year	Actual
2003	1,522,922
2004	4,249,668
We exceeded our 2004 target of 2,000,000.	

**Source.** Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, What Works Clearinghouse Web site.

**Data Quality.** Automated Web software enables an accurate count of Web hits, exact items receiving the greatest number of hits, and time intervals of Web site visits.

**Target Context.** The Department modified the 2004 target in December 2003 based on FY 2003 data, which were the first data available. Preliminary evidence suggests increased activity on the Web site with the release of the study reports.

**Related information.** Additional information on the What Works Clearinghouse is available at <http://w-w-c.org/> or call 301-519-5444.

The What Works Clearinghouse Web site was created in October 2002. At that time, it posted information about

research standards. On June 30, 2004, the What Works Clearinghouse released its first study reports assessing the strengths and weaknesses of specific studies. These reports evaluated peer-assisted learning interventions and middle school mathematics curricula. The What Works Clearinghouse study reports are written for educators, policy-makers, and the general public.

## OBJECTIVE 2.1: READING ACHIEVEMENT

2.1.1–2.1.6 Of states with third-grade reading assessments, the percentage meeting their targets for third-grade reading achievement						
Fiscal Year	All Students	Low-Income Students	African American Students	Hispanic Students	Students with Disabilities	Limited English Proficient Students
2003	100	83	83	83	33	50
2004	Target is 100.	Target is 100.	Target is 100.	Target is 100.	Target is 100.	Target is 100.
	We exceeded our 2003 target of 87. Data for 2004 are pending.	We did not meet our 2003 target of 87. Data for 2004 are pending.	We did not meet our 2003 target of 87. Data for 2004 are pending.	We did not meet our 2003 target of 87. Data for 2004 are pending.	We did not meet our 2003 target of 87. Data for 2004 are pending.	We did not meet our 2003 target of 87. Data for 2004 are pending.

States = States and jurisdictions that are required under No Child Left Behind to implement assessment systems; this includes the 50 states, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico.

**Source.** Department of Education, 2002–03 Consolidated State Performance Reports.

**Data Quality.** States submit Consolidated State Performance Reports to the Office of Elementary and Secondary Education. Of the 52 eligible entities, 26 tested third-grade reading with standards-based assessments. Of the remaining 26 entities, 22 did not test third-grade reading/language arts in SY 2002–03, and four tested third-grade reading/language arts with non-standards-based assessments. These four states were under time line waivers or compliance agreements with the Department for failing to meet the standards and assessments requirements of the 1994 Improving America's Schools Act. There are also a few occasions where a state did not report for one or more subpopulations. In addition, Puerto Rico reports on the subgroup limited Spanish proficient in lieu of limited English proficient.

**Target Context.** Although states are not required to test third-grade reading until SY 2005–06, the Department's expectation is that beginning with 2004, those states that do test will meet their targets for all students in the aggregate and for each subgroup of students.

**Related Information.** Information on the Consolidated State Performance Reports can be obtained at <http://www.ed.gov/admins/lead/account/consolidated/index.html#csp>.

**Additional Information.** Data for 2004 (SY 2003–04) will be available in January 2005.

Starting with SY 2002–03, each state was required to set the same annual achievement target for all students and for several student subgroups. State targets were based on assessments from SY 2001–02. The first tests that measure against these targets were administered in SY 2002–03. Therefore, FY 2003 is the first year for which state-level data were available. Each state must issue a State Report Card that includes its annual assessment and achievement data.

The Department is investing substantial sums in high-quality content enrichment for providers of after school services.

The Department is contracting to provide technical assistance to LEAs that did not receive Reading First grants to replicate effective practices through Reading First grants. The Department will have a new CD-ROM and accompanying booklet for distribution this fall providing examples of scientifically based strategies for early reading in preschool programs.

**OBJECTIVE 2.2: MATHEMATICS AND SCIENCE ACHIEVEMENT**

<b>2.2.1–2.2.6</b> Percentage of states meeting their targets for middle school mathematics achievement						
<b>Fiscal Year</b>	<b>All Students</b>	<b>Low-Income Students</b>	<b>African American Students</b>	<b>Hispanic Students</b>	<b>Students with Disabilities</b>	<b>Limited English Proficient Students</b>
2003	Grade 6 = <b>94</b> Grade 7 = <b>93</b> Grade 8 = <b>95</b>	Grade 6 = <b>53</b> Grade 7 = <b>50</b> Grade 8 = <b>37</b>	Grade 6 = <b>44</b> Grade 7 = <b>21</b> Grade 8 = <b>22</b>	Grade 6 = <b>75</b> Grade 7 = <b>43</b> Grade 8 = <b>38</b>	Grade 6 = <b>18</b> Grade 7 = <b>21</b> Grade 8 = <b>11</b>	Grade 6 = <b>35</b> Grade 7 = <b>21</b> Grade 8 = <b>16</b>
2004	Target is 100.	Target is 100.	Target is 100.	Target is 100.	Target is 100.	Target is 100.
	We exceeded our 2003 target of 87 for each of the three middle school grades. Data for 2004 are pending.	We did not meet our 2003 target of 87 for any of the three middle school grades. Data for 2004 are pending.	We did not meet our 2003 target of 87 for any of the three middle school grades. Data for 2004 are pending.	We did not meet our 2003 target of 87 for any of the three middle school grades. Data for 2004 are pending.	We did not meet our 2003 target of 87 for any of the three middle school grades. Data for 2004 are pending.	We did not meet our 2003 target of 87 for any of the three middle school grades. Data for 2004 are pending.

States = States and jurisdictions that are required under No Child Left Behind to implement assessment systems; this includes the 50 states, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico.

**Source.** Department of Education, 2002–03 Consolidated State Performance Reports.

**Data Quality.** States submit Consolidated State Performance Reports to the Office of Elementary and Secondary Education. Of the 52 eligible entities, 18 tested mathematics with standards-based assessments in the sixth grade, 14 in the seventh grade, and 39 in the eighth grade.

Of the 34 entities reported as not assessing mathematics in the sixth grade, four assessed sixth-grade mathematics with non-standards-based assessments and 30 states did not assess mathematics at that grade. Of the 38 entities reported as not assessing mathematics in the seventh grade, four assessed seventh-grade mathematics with non-standards-based assessments and 34 did not assess mathematics in that grade. Of the 13 entities reported as not assessing mathematics in eighth grade, four assessed eighth-grade mathematics with non-standards-based assessments and nine did not assess mathematics at that grade. The four states testing with non-standards-based assessments were under time line waivers or compliance agreements with the Department for failing to meet the standards and assessments requirements of the 1994 Improving America's Schools Act. There were also a few occasions where a state did not report for one or more subpopulations.

**Target Context.** Although states are not required to assess mathematics in all middle school grades until SY 2005–06, the Department's expectation is that beginning with 2004, those states that do test will meet their targets for all students in the aggregate and for each subgroup of students.

**Related Information.** Information on the Consolidated State Performance Reports can be obtained at <http://www.ed.gov/admins/lead/account/consolidated/index.html>.

**Additional Information.** Data for 2004 (SY 2003–04) will be available in January 2005.

Starting with SY 2002–03, each state was required to set the same annual achievement target for all students and for several student subgroups. State targets were based on assessments from SY 2001–02. The first tests that measure against these targets were administered in SY 2002–03. Therefore, FY 2003 is the first year for which state-level data were available. Each state must issue a State Report Card that includes its annual assessment and achievement data.

The Department is undertaking an initiative to increase and improve professional development and instruction in high-poverty schools in mathematics for grades K–8. Increased collaboration between mathematics experts and the Title I community is the vehicle for this effort. In line with the Department's Mathematics Science Partnership program recommendations, most states have targeted middle grades mathematics as their focus.



**OBJECTIVE 2.3: HIGH SCHOOL ACHIEVEMENT**

<b>2.3.1–2.3.6</b> Percentage of states meeting their targets for high school reading achievement						
<b>Fiscal Year</b>	<b>All Students</b>	<b>Low-Income Students</b>	<b>African American Students</b>	<b>Hispanic Students</b>	<b>Students with Disabilities</b>	<b>Limited English Proficient Students</b>
2003	<b>95</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>9</b>
2004	Target is 100.	Target is 100.	Target is 100.	Target is 100.	Target is 100.	Target is 100.
	We exceeded our 2003 target of 87. Data for 2004 are pending.	We did not meet our 2003 target of 87. Data for 2004 are pending.	We did not meet our 2003 target of 87. Data for 2004 are pending.	We did not meet our 2003 target of 87. Data for 2004 are pending.	We did not meet our 2003 target of 87. Data for 2004 are pending.	We did not meet our 2003 target of 87. Data for 2004 are pending.

States = States and jurisdictions that are required under No Child Left Behind to implement assessment systems; this includes the 50 states, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico.

**Source.** Department of Education, 2002–03 Consolidated State Performance Reports.

**Data Quality.** States submit Consolidated State Performance Reports to the Office of Elementary and Secondary Education for review. Of the 52 eligible entities, data from four entities are not included because those states did not administer standards-based assessments in high school reading/language arts in FY 2002–03. These four states were under time line waivers or compliance agreements with the Department for failing to meet the standards and assessments requirements of the 1994 Improving America's Schools Act. Data from two additional states are not included because those state report assessment results using an index. There are also a few occasions where a state did not report for one or more subpopulations. In addition, Puerto Rico reports on the subgroup limited Spanish proficient in lieu of limited English proficient.

**Target Context.** States are required to test reading in at least one grade from 10 to 12; and the Department's expectation is that beginning in 2004 all states will meet their targets for all students in the aggregate and for each subgroup of students.

**Related Information.** Information on the Consolidated State Performance Reports can be obtained at <http://www.ed.gov/admins/lead/account/consolidated/index.html>.

**Additional Information.** Data for 2004 (SY 2003–04) will be available in January 2005.

Starting with SY 2002–03, each state was required to set the same annual achievement target for all students and for several student subgroups. State targets were based on assessments from SY 2001–02. The first tests that measure against these targets were administered in

SY 2002–03. Therefore, FY 2003 is the first year for which state-level data were available. Each state must issue a State Report Card that includes its annual assessment and achievement data.

The Department completed reviews of the programs active in each state to meet the high quality teacher requirements of No Child Left Behind. The Department held a series of technical assistance visits to each state by Teacher Assistance Corps personnel to address the issues identified in the reviews and provide useful ideas.

Teacher-to-Teacher workshops were held in Summer 2004 for 1,400 teachers. The presenters were exemplary teachers and Department staff, who described, explained, and demonstrated techniques and practices that had been shown effective in closing the achievement gap. The Department is launching "Lessons Learned" at <http://www.ed.gov/teacherquality>, which includes videos of lessons taught by these teachers, study guides, and checklists, etc.

Beginning in June 2004, the Department began monitoring the practices employed by states to improve teacher knowledge of core academic subjects, intended to meet high quality teacher requirements and, ultimately, to improve student achievement in reading, mathematics and the other core academic subjects.

Additionally, Title I monitoring of states is occurring on a three-year cycle. The Department reviews activities being carried out in each state under No Child Left Behind Title I (Part A), Even Start, Neglected & Delinquent, and Homeless for their instructional effectiveness and technical assistance provided statewide.

2.3.7–2.3.12 Percentage of states meeting their targets for high school mathematics achievement						
Fiscal Year	All Students	Low-Income Students	African American Students	Hispanic Students	Students with Disabilities	Limited English Proficient Students
2003	93	31	22	34	7	24
2004	Target is 100.	Target is 100.	Target is 100.	Target is 100.	Target is 100.	Target is 100.
	We exceeded our 2003 target of 87. Data for 2004 are pending.	We did not meet our 2003 target of 87. Data for 2004 are pending.	We did not meet our 2003 target of 87. Data for 2004 are pending.	We did not meet our 2003 target of 87. Data for 2004 are pending.	We did not meet our 2003 target of 87. Data for 2004 are pending.	We did not meet our 2003 target of 87. Data for 2004 are pending.

States = States and jurisdictions that are required under No Child Left Behind to implement assessment systems; this includes the 50 states, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico.

**Source.** Department of Education, 2002–03 Consolidated State Performance Reports.

**Data Quality.** States submit Consolidated State Performance Reports to the Office of Elementary and Secondary Education for review. Of the 52 eligible entities, one state did not report high school mathematics assessment data. Data from four entities are not included because those states did not administer standards-based assessments in high school mathematics in FY 2002–03. These four states were under time line waivers or compliance agreements with the Department for failing to meet the standards and assessments requirements of the 1994 Improving American's Schools Act. Data from two additional states are not included because those states report assessment results using an index. There are also a few occasions where a state did not report for one or more subpopulations. In addition, Puerto Rico reports on the subgroup limited Spanish proficient in lieu of limited English proficient.

**Target Context.** States are required to test mathematics in at least one grade level from 10 to 12; the Department's expectation is that all states will meet their targets for all students in the aggregate and for each subgroup of students.

**Related Information.** Information on the Consolidated State Performance Reports can be obtained at

<http://www.ed.gov/admins/lead/account/consolidated/index.html#csp>.

Information on NAEP can be obtained at <http://nces.ed.gov/nationsreportcard/>.

**Additional Information.** Data for 2004 (SY 2003–04) will be available in January 2005.

Starting with SY 2002–03, each state was required to set the same annual achievement target for all students and for several student subgroups. State targets were based on assessments from SY 2001–02. The first tests that measure against these targets were administered in SY 2002–03. Therefore, FY 2003 is the first year for which state-level data were available. Each state must issue a State Report Card that includes its annual assessment and achievement data.

The Department sponsored a national high school summit followed by seven regional high school summits to specifically address improving the academic achievement of high school students. In addition, the Department has begun making competitive awards to state educational agencies to support efforts to raise state standards in high schools and middle schools. Further, the Department provided state and local educational agencies with the latest reform models, data, research, and content experts to enable their efforts at improving their plans for high school improvement.

2.3.13–2.3.15 Percentage of 12th-grade students who took at least one Advanced Placement exam			
Fiscal Year	All Students	African American Students	Hispanic Students
1999	11.7	3.4	6.4
2000	12.4	3.9	7.4
2001	13.2	4.1	8.1
2002	14.2	4.5	8.9
2003	14.8	4.9	10.0
2004	15.2	5.7	11.6
	We made progress toward our 2004 target of 16.	We made progress toward our 2004 target of 7.	We made progress toward our 2004 target of 12.

2.3.16–2.3.19 Percentage of 12th-grade students who scored 3 or higher on at least one Advanced Placement exam				
Fiscal Year	English	History	Calculus	Science
2000	68.8	66.5	64.3	60.7
2001	63.4	63.8	64.7	58.3
2002	66.4	66.7	67.8	59.7
2003	63.5	65.6	66.7	59.7
2004	<b>65.2</b>	<b>66.6</b>	<b>61.2</b>	<b>57.6</b>
	We made progress toward our 2004 target of 65.5.	We made progress toward our 2004 target of 67.6.	We did not meet our 2004 target of 68.7.	We did not meet our 2004 target of 59.9.

This measure was significantly modified in FY 2004.

**Source.** College Board, *Advanced Placement Program National Summary Reports*, 1999, 2000, 2001, 2002, 2003, and 2004.

U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, *Digest of Education Statistics*, 2002.

U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, *Private School Universe Survey: 2001–2002*, table 13.

U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, *Projections of Education Statistics to 2013*, table 3.

U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, The NCES Common Core of Data, State Nonfiscal Survey of Public Elementary/Secondary Education, various years; and National Elementary and Secondary Enrollment Model, table 3. (This table was prepared June 2003.)

**Data Quality.** Advanced Placement (AP) participation and achievement measures are calculated by using data from the Advanced Placement Program National Summary Reports, 12th-grade candidates, which are available at <http://www.apcentral.collegeboard.com>. The College Board and the Educational Testing Service validate data according to their own statistical standards. AP Summary Reports provide the numerator for determining the percentage of all 12th-grade U.S. students who took at least one AP exam. The denominator is the total of all U.S. students, in both public and private school, enrolled in 12th grade for the year of the AP test. The denominator comes from 12th-grade enrollment figures as they appear in the National Center for Education Statistics documents listed in Source. The National Center for Education Statistics validates its data according to its own statistical standards.

Numerators and denominators for calculating African American and Hispanic participation are arrived at by a similar method.

The formula for determining the percentage of all 12th-grade U.S. students who scored 3 or higher on the AP exams is the total number of the 12th-grade U.S.

candidates who scored 3, 4, or 5 on the particular test divided by the total number of 12th-grade student candidates who took the particular test.

**Target Context.** Prior to FY 2004, the Department measured the percentage of all 12th-grade students who scored 3 or higher on at least one Advanced Placement exam, and targets were set based on special analyses of 2000 data provided by the College Board.

Effective FY 2004, the Department modified this measure to use a universe of only those students who took Advanced Placement exams. New targets were established based on recomputed trend data.

**Related Information.** The *Digest of Education Statistics* is available at <http://nces.ed.gov/programs/digest>.

The Private School Universe Survey: 2001–2002 is available at <http://nces.ed.gov/ncestaff/survdetl.asp?surveyid=002>.

The *Projections of Education Statistics to 2012* is available at [http://nces.ed.gov/programs/projections/tables/table\\_03.asp](http://nces.ed.gov/programs/projections/tables/table_03.asp).

**Additional Information.** Since 1999, the Department's Advanced Placement Incentives Program has provided funds to states for the payment of AP test fees for low-income students. Appropriations for this program have continued to increase slightly over the years, and the fee payment is expected to continue to help increase participation in AP exams. AP achievement (a score of 3, 4, or 5 on an AP test) depends on more than participation in an AP class. Students are expected to draw from strong academic backgrounds in the subject areas of the AP exams. One year of participation in an AP class may not provide the depth of experience in a subject required by a rigorous AP exam. To improve the achievement of students on AP exams, the Department will continue to focus on Goal 2.3 activities designed to create a more rigorous academic curriculum for high school students.

The Department is giving an absolute priority for the improvement of pre-Advanced Placement and Advanced Placement curricula, teacher staff

development, and student support services targeting disadvantaged students in its Advanced Placement grants competition.

<b>2.3.20–2.3.22</b> Percentage of 18- to 24-year-olds who have completed high school			
<b>Fiscal Year</b>	<b>All</b>	<b>African Americans</b>	<b>Hispanic Americans</b>
1999	85.9	83.5	63.4
2000	86.5	83.7	64.1
2001	86.5	85.6	65.7
2002	<b>86.6</b>	<b>84.7</b>	<b>67.3</b>
2003	Target is 86.5.	Target is 84.5.	Target is 66.0.
2004	Target is 87.5.	Target is 85.5.	Target is 69.0.
	We exceeded our 2002 target of 86.1. Data for 2003 and 2004 are pending.	We exceeded our 2002 target of 84.0. Data for 2003 and 2004 are pending.	We exceeded our 2002 target of 64.0. Data for 2003 and 2004 are pending.

**Source.** U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, Current Population Survey, October 1999–2001.

Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics (NCES), *Dropout Rates in the United States: 2002*.

**Data Quality.** Data were validated by Bureau of the Census review procedures and by NCES validation procedures.

**Target Context.** High school completion targets are based on performance data that have been tracked by the U.S. Census Bureau in the Current Population Survey, October (1972–2002). The 1972 performance data provided a baseline for this measure; subsequent targets indicate incremental goals for making progress in high school completion.

**Related Information.** *Dropout Rates in the United States: 2000* is available at <http://nces.ed.gov/pubsearch/pubsinfo.asp?pubid=2002114>.

The Common Core of Data survey system of the NCES annually collects information about public school dropouts and completers from states that report dropouts. *Public High School Dropouts and Completers from the Common Core of Data: 2002* is available at <http://nces.ed.gov/pubsearch/pubsinfo.asp?pubid=2002382>.

**Additional Information.** Data for 2003 will be available in October 2005; data for 2004 will be available in October 2006.

High school completion rates represent the proportion of 18- to 24-year-olds not currently enrolled in high school or below who have completed a high school diploma or an equivalent credential, including a General Educational Development (GED) credential.

## OBJECTIVE 2.4: TEACHER AND PRINCIPAL QUALITY

<b>2.4.1</b> Percentage of classes taught by teachers of core academic subjects that are <i>highly qualified</i> as defined by No Child Left Behind	
<b>Fiscal Year</b>	<b>Actual</b>
2003	<b>See below.</b>
2004	Target is 75.
Data for 2004 are pending.	

This measure was first established for FY 2004.

<b>State</b>	<b>Percentage of Classes (or Teachers<sup>1</sup>) 2003</b>
Alabama	35.3
Alaska	Data not available
Arizona	95
Arkansas	Data not available
California	48
Colorado	86.1
Connecticut	96.0
Delaware	85
District of Columbia	43.1
Florida	91.1
Georgia	94
Hawaii	80.3
Idaho	98.1
Illinois	97.9
Indiana	96.2
Iowa	94.8
Kansas	80
Kentucky	95
Louisiana	85
Maine	Data not available
Maryland	64.5
Massachusetts	94
Michigan	95
Minnesota	Data not available
Mississippi	85
Missouri	95.1
Montana	Data not available
Nebraska	90
Nevada	50
New Hampshire	86
New Jersey	Data not available

<sup>1</sup> See Data Quality discussion.

State	Percentage of Classes (or Teachers) <sup>1</sup> 2003
New Mexico	77
New York	Data not available
North Carolina	83
North Dakota	91.1
Ohio	82
Oklahoma	98.0
Oregon	81.8
Pennsylvania	95
Puerto Rico	Data not available
Rhode Island	Data not available
South Carolina	Data not available
South Dakota	88.7
Tennessee	33.9
Texas	75.8
Utah	Data not available
Vermont	92
Virginia	83
Washington	83
West Virginia	94
Wisconsin	Data not available
Wyoming	95

<sup>1</sup>See Data Quality Discussion.

**Source.** Department of Education, 2002–03 Consolidated State Performance Reports.

**Data Quality.** Data protocols for SY 2002–03 vary considerably from state to state and may include estimates; partial data; and percentage of teachers or percentages of classes. In some cases, special education teachers are included; in other cases, they are not. The Department expects to be able to report more accurate and complete data for all states beginning with SY 2003–04.

In the September 2003 Consolidated State Application and Part I of the December 2003 Consolidated State Performance Report, states were asked to provide baseline data from the 2002–03 school year for the percentage of classes in the core academic subjects being taught by “highly qualified” teachers (as the term is defined in section 9101(23) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act), in the aggregate and in high- and low-poverty schools. Section 1111(h)(1)(C)(viii) defines “high-poverty” and “low-poverty schools” as schools in the top and bottom quartiles of poverty in the state.

SY 2002–03 was the first year that states were required to collect and report data on the percentage of core academic classes taught by highly qualified teachers. The information that must be collected for this data requirement is complex—states must match individual classroom data with individual teacher qualification data and then disaggregate those data by school poverty levels. For states that were unable to collect and merge these data sets for SY 2002–03, the Department placed conditions on their Title I and Title II October 2003 grant awards requiring them to submit detailed data collection plans for SY 2003–04 and for future years for how the state will collect and report these data.

**Related Information.** More information on how to become a highly qualified teacher is available at <http://www.ed.gov/teachers/become/programs/list.jhtml?page=24&size=10&sort=date&desc=show>.

**Additional Information.** Data for 2004 will be available in September 2005.

The No Child Left Behind Act requires that each state educational agency have a plan to ensure that all teachers teaching in core academic subjects within the state are highly qualified no later than the end of SY 2005–06. The requirement that teachers be highly qualified applies to all public elementary or secondary school teachers employed by a local educational agency who teach a core academic subject. “Highly qualified” means that the teacher must meet all of the following:

1. Has obtained full state certification as a teacher or passed the state teacher licensing examination and holds a license to teach in the state, and does not have certification or licensure requirements waived on an emergency, temporary, or provisional basis.
2. Holds a minimum of a bachelor’s degree.
3. Has demonstrated subject matter competency in each of the academic subjects in which the teacher teaches, in a manner determined by the state and in compliance with section 9101(23) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

The statutory definition includes additional elements that apply somewhat differently to new and current teachers, and to elementary, middle, and secondary school teachers. The complete definition of a “highly qualified” teacher is in section 9101(23) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. The term “core academic subjects” means English, reading or language arts, mathematics, science, foreign languages, civics and government, economics, arts, history, and geography [section 9101(11)]. While the statute includes the arts in the core academic subjects, it does not specify which of the arts are core academic subjects; therefore, states must make this determination.

As it relates to special educators, No Child Left Behind provides that the highly qualified teacher requirements apply only to those teachers who provide direct instruction in core academic subjects. Special educators who do not directly instruct in core academic subjects or who provide only consultation to highly qualified teachers in adapting curricula, using behavioral supports and interventions, or selecting appropriate accommodations are not required to demonstrate subject-matter competency in those subjects.

Further, the Department has provided flexibility for teachers in three areas (rural, science, and current multi-subject teachers) to demonstrate that they are highly qualified. Additional information can be found at: <http://www.ed.gov/nclb/methods/teachers/hqtflexibility.html>.

### OBJECTIVE 2.5: U.S. STUDENTS' KNOWLEDGE OF WORLD LANGUAGES, REGIONS, AND INTERNATIONAL ISSUES AND INTERNATIONAL TIES IN EDUCATION

2.5.1 Percentage of public secondary school (grades 9–12) students enrolled in foreign-language courses	
Fiscal Year	Actual
1994	41.0
2000	43.6
2004	Not collected
We did not collect data for 2004 because the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Language modified its survey schedule.	

This measure was first established for FY 2004.

**Source.** Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, *Digest of Education Statistics*, 2002, table 57. (Used for data for 1994 and 2000.)

**Data Quality.** NCES obtains these data from the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages on the average every four years.

**Target Context.** At the time the target for 2004 was set, the most recent data were for 1994, with 41 percent enrollment. The Department projected an increase to 43 percent. Future targets will be reconsidered based on new trend data.

Since 1976, enrollment in foreign language courses has steadily increased from 22.2 percent to the most recent rate of 43.6 percent. The most marked increase has occurred in Spanish enrollment; a 52 percent increase in the period 1976–90 and a 55.4 percent increase in 1990–2000.

**Related Information.** More information on the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages is available at <http://www.actfl.org/>.

**Additional Information.** The Department is pursuing a data source for this measure.

2.5.2 Number of U.S. postsecondary students studying abroad	
Fiscal Year	Actual
2000	143,590
2001	154,168
2002	160,920
2004	Target is 164,000.
Data for 2003 and 2004 are pending.	

This measure was first established for FY 2004.

**Source.** Institute of International Education, Open Doors Survey, November 2003.

**Data Quality.** The Institute for International Education is an independent, nonprofit organization founded in 1919 and recognized as a world leader in the international exchange of people and ideas.

In 2002–03, surveys were sent to 1,286 accredited colleges and universities throughout the United States. They were asked to provide information on the number of their own students to whom they awarded credit for study abroad in 2001–02, including the summer of 2002. There was an 87 percent response rate. The survey population includes students who have studied in a program sponsored by a U.S. university or other entity, and who received academic credit toward their degree at a U.S. institution of higher education.

**Target Context.** The number of U.S. postsecondary students studying abroad has consistently increased.

**Related Information.** More information on Open Doors is available at <http://opendoors.iienetwork.org/>.

More information on the institute is available at <http://www.iie.org/>.

**Additional Information.** Data for 2003 (SY 2002–03) will be available in November 2004. Data for 2004 will be available in November 2005.

Open Doors reports include comprehensive and detailed data on international students, scholars in the United States, and U.S. students who study abroad. The Institute for International Education implements the Fulbright and Humphrey Fellowships.

**OBJECTIVE 3.1: SAFE AND DRUG FREE SCHOOLS**

<b>3.1.1 –3.1.2</b> Rate of violent crimes and serious violent crimes experienced at school by students ages 12–18		
<b>Fiscal Year</b>	<b>Violent Crime</b>	<b>Serious Violent Crime</b>
1999	33/1000	7/1000
2000	26/1000	5/1000
2001	28/1000	6/1000
2002	<b>24/1000</b>	<b>3/1000</b>
2003	Target is 24/1000.	Target is 4/1000.
2004	Target is 23/1000.	Target is 4/1000.
	We met our 2002 target of 24/1000. Data for 2003 and 2004 are pending.	We did better than our 2002 target of 4/1000. Data for 2003 and 2004 are pending.

**Source.** U.S. Departments of Education and Justice, *Indicators of School Crime and Safety*.

**Data Quality.** The primary source of new data that provides information on the experiences of victimization at school is the *Indicators of School Crime and Safety* report, which is released annually and includes a special analysis of the National Crime Victimization Survey (NCVS). The *Indicators of School Crime and Safety* report uses a variety of independent data sources from federal departments and agencies including the Census Bureau, the National Center for Education Statistics, the Bureau of Justice Statistics, and the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Each agency uses its own statistical procedures to validate the data. Survey estimates are derived from a stratified, multistage cluster sample of schools.

**Target Context.** Historical data were analyzed to provide an ambitious but achievable target.

**Related Information.** Data from the school crime supplement to the NCVS are available at [http://nces.ed.gov/programs/quarterly/Vol\\_4/4\\_4\\_q2\\_2.asp](http://nces.ed.gov/programs/quarterly/Vol_4/4_4_q2_2.asp).

The *Indicators of School Crime and Safety* report is available at <http://www.nces.ed.gov/pubs2004/2004004.pdf>.

**Additional Information.** The most recent available data are for 2002. Data for 2003 are expected in November 2005, and data for 2004 in November 2006.

Violent crime includes serious violent crime and simple assault. Serious violent crime includes rape, sexual assault, robbery, and aggravated assault. Most NCVS data are reported the year after collection, but in-school victimization data come from a special analysis with a delayed release.

<b>3.1.3–3.1.5</b> Percentage of youth ages 12–17 who reported using the following substances in the past 30 days			
<b>Fiscal Year</b>	<b>Alcohol</b>	<b>Tobacco (Cigarettes)</b>	<b>Marijuana</b>
1999	16.5	14.9	7.2
2000	16.4	13.4	7.2
2001	17.3	13.0	8.0
2002	17.6	<b>13.0</b>	8.2
2003	<b>17.7</b>	<b>12.2</b>	<b>7.9</b>
2004	Target is 14.	Target is 11.	Target is 7.
	We did not meet our 2003 target of 12.2. Data for 2004 are pending.	We made progress toward our 2003 target of 10.3. Data for 2004 are pending.	We made progress toward our 2003 target of 7. Data for 2004 are pending.

**Source.** The Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration (SAMHSA), the National Survey on Drug Use and Health (formerly called the National Household Survey on Drug Abuse).

**Data Quality.** National Survey on Drug Use and Health data are validated by SAMHSA. Data are updated annually. The project interviews approximately 70,000 people aged 12 years or older, in every state, annually. Because of the size of the sample, it is possible to make relatively precise estimates of many variables of major interest. The former variable for “marijuana” is replaced in the survey with “marijuana and hashish.”

Methodological changes in the administration of the National Survey on Drug Use and Health, including payment of an incentive fee to respondents, improved quality control procedures, and the addition of new population data into the survey’s sample weighting procedures affect the comparability of the 2002 and 2003 data with those of prior years.

In this report, we correct an error in the value we reported last year for cigarette use. In last year’s report, we inadvertently reported the figure for “any tobacco”; the measure refers to “cigarettes.” The value is corrected from 15.2 percent to 13.0 percent.

**Target Context.** Historical data were analyzed to provide an ambitious but achievable target.

**Related Information.** Data from the National Survey on Drug Use and Health are available at <http://www.oas.samhsa.gov/nhsda.htm>.

**Additional Information.** FY 2004 data will be available in October 2005.

The Department’s Office of Safe and Drug-Free Schools is targeting its efforts toward improving the outcomes of these measures.

<b>3.1.6–3.1.7</b> Percentage of youth ages 12–17 who reported using the following substances in the past 30 days (discontinued effective FY 2004)		
<b>Fiscal Year</b>	<b>Cocaine</b>	<b>Heroin</b>
1999	0.5	0.2
2000	0.6	0.1
2001	0.4	0.0
2002	0.6	0.0
2003	<b>0.6</b>	<b>0.1</b>
	We did not meet our 2003 target of 0.37.	We exceeded our 2003 target of 0.15

**Source.** The Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration (SAMHSA), the National Survey on Drug Use and Health (formerly called the National Household Survey on Drug Abuse).

**Final Report on FY 2003 Measures.** These measures were discontinued effective FY 2004. The Department is reporting FY 2003 results, which were pending at the time of the publication of the *FY 2003 Performance and Accountability Report*.

**Data Quality.** National Survey on Drug Use and Health data are validated by SAMHSA. Data are updated annually. The project interviews approximately 70,000 people aged 12 years or older, in every state, annually. Because of the size of the sample, it is possible to make relatively precise estimates of many variables of major interest.

**Related Information.** Data from the National Survey on Drug Use and Health are available at <http://www.oas.samhsa.gov/nhsda/2k2nsduh/Results/2k2Results.htm>.

**Additional Information.** The Department discontinued this measure effective 2004.

<b>3.1.8–3.1.10</b> Percentage of high school students who report any substance use on school property in the previous 30 days			
<b>Fiscal Year</b>	<b>Alcohol</b>	<b>Cigarettes</b>	<b>Marijuana</b>
1999	4.9	14	7.2
2001	4.9	9.9	5.4
2003	<b>5.2</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>5.8</b>
	We did not meet our 2003 target of 5.	We did better than our 2003 target of 14.	We did better than our 2003 target of 7.

<b>3.1.11</b> Percentage of high school students who report being offered, sold, or given an illegal drug on school property in the previous 12 months	
<b>Fiscal Year</b>	<b>Actual</b>
2001	28.5
2003	<b>28.7</b>
We did better than our 2003 target of 29.	

**Source.** Centers for Disease Control, Youth Risk Behavior Surveillance System.

**Data Quality.** The Youth Risk Behavior Surveillance System surveys students about issues associated with youth morbidity and mortality, including violence and drug and alcohol use. The system includes national, state, and local school-based surveys of students. The national survey, conducted for the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, provides data from a nationally representative sample of high school students in public and private schools in the United States. Data are collected biennially in odd years, usually during the spring semester, and are analyzed and reported on the year following collection.

**Target Context.** Historical data were analyzed to provide an ambitious but achievable target.

**Related Information.** Data from the Youth Risk Behavior surveys are available at <http://www.cdc.gov/HealthyYouth/yrbs/index.html>.

**Additional Information.** We are reporting 2003 data not previously reported. 2004 is an off year for this biennial collection.

The Department's Office of Safe and Drug-Free Schools is targeting its efforts toward improving these outcomes, especially the outcome concerning the use of alcohol.

## OBJECTIVE 3.2: CHARACTER AND CITIZENSHIP

<b>3.2.1</b> Percentage of students in grade 12 who participate in community service or volunteer work	
<b>Fiscal Year</b>	<b>Actual</b>
1999	75.3
2000	75.2
2001	77.4
2003	<b>Not collected</b>
2004	<b>Not collected</b>
We did not collect data for 2003 or 2004 because previously used sources no longer collect this information.	

**Source.** University of Michigan, Survey Research Center, Monitoring the Future, Supplemental Analysis.

**Data Quality.** Monitoring the Future is a repeated series of surveys in which segments of the population (8th-, 10th-, and 12th-graders) are presented with the same set of questions over a period of years to see how answers change over time. Data were collected from



students during the spring of each year; however, data for this measure will not be collected in 2003 or thereafter. Further, there is no other source that provides these data. Therefore, the Department plans to discontinue this measure.

**Related Information.** Information about Monitoring the Future is available at <http://www.monitoringthefuture.org/>.

3.2.2 The percentage of students in grade 12 who think most of the students in their classes would dislike it or dislike it very much if a student intentionally did things to make his/her teachers angry	
Fiscal Year	Actual
1999	33.6
2000	32.1
2001	30.6
2002	34.7
2003	35.2
2004	Target is 36.
We exceeded our 2003 target of 34. Data for 2004 are pending.	

This measure was first established for FY 2003.

3.2.3 The percentage of students in grade 12 who think that most students in their classes would dislike it or dislike it very much if a student cheated on a test	
Fiscal Year	Actual
1999	14.8
2000	12.2
2001	13.5
2002	14.9
2003	14.1
2004	Target is 19.
We did not meet our 2003 target of 17. Data for 2004 are pending.	

This measure was first established for FY 2003.

**Source.** University of Michigan, Survey Research Center, Monitoring the Future.

**Data Quality.** This project is a repeated series of surveys in which segments of the population (8th-, 10th-, and 12th-graders) are presented with the same set of questions over a period of years to see how answers change over time. Data are collected from students during the spring each year. Each year's data collection takes place in approximately 420 public and private high schools and middle schools selected to provide an accurate representative cross section of students throughout the contiguous United States.

**Target Context.** Historical data were analyzed to provide an ambitious but achievable target.

**Related Information.** Information about Monitoring the Future is available at <http://www.monitoringthefuture.org/>.

**Additional Information.** Data for 2004 will be available in December 2005.

Monitoring the Future, begun in 1975, has many purposes, including studying changes in the beliefs, attitudes, and behavior of young people in the United States.

The Department's Office of Safe and Drug-Free Schools is targeting its efforts toward improving these outcomes.

3.2.4 Percentage of 14- to 18-year-olds who believe cheating occurs by half or most students	
Fiscal Year	Actual
1999	43
2000	41
2003	50
2004	Target is 40.
Data for 2004 are pending.	

**Source.** The Horatio Alger Association, State of Our Nation's Youth Survey.

**Data Quality.** On the basis of a telephone survey of about 1,003 students across the country, about 505 geographic points were selected randomly and proportionate to the population of each region and, within each region, by size of place. Individuals were selected in accordance with a probability sample design that gives all telephone numbers an equal chance to be included. The data's statistical margin of sampling error is  $\pm 3.1$  percentage points. Minimal weights were applied to sex and year in school.

The survey question on cheating was not asked in 2001 or 2002. Data from 2003 forward may not be comparable to previous years because the question and response options were changed for the 2003 survey. Previous measures aggregated data about students who *believe* that cheating occurs in either no or few students or in half or most students. The 2003 measure asked respondents from what they *know*, what proportion of students cheat using the following categories: just a few, about 25 percent, about half, about 75 percent, near all, or not sure. The figure reported is the aggregate of the responses for about half, about 75 percent, and nearly all categories.

**Target Context.** The target for 2004 was set based on the question in the survey for 2002 and prior years. Data from 2004 will be used to set new targets for future years, based on the new question.

**Related Information.** Information on this survey may be obtained from the Horatio Alger Association at 703-684-9444 or is available at <http://www.horatioalger.com/>.

**Additional Information.** Data for FY 2004 will be available in late November 2004.

**OBJECTIVE 4.1: HIGH-QUALITY RESEARCH**

<b>4.1.1</b> Percentage of new IES and OSEP research and evaluation projects funded by the Department to conduct research on or evaluate programs, practices, and policies designed to improve student learning and achievement that are deemed to be of high quality by an independent review panel of qualified scientists	
Fiscal Year	Actual
2001	40
2002	53
2003	66
2004	60 (est)
We did not meet our 2004 target of 70.	

est = estimated, preliminary, or partial data

<b>4.1.2</b> Percentage of new IES and OSEP research and evaluation publications reporting research on or evaluation of programs, practices, and policies designed to improve student learning and achievement that are deemed to be of high quality by an independent review panel of qualified scientists	
Fiscal Year	Actual
2001	0
2002	100
2003	Not applicable
2004	Not applicable
There were no 2004 publications to review.	

**Source.** Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences (IES), independent external review panels.

**Data Quality.** Review panels composed of senior scientists with expertise in various content areas evaluated a random sample of newly funded proposals for IES and Office of Special Education Programs (OESP) projects. Reviews are standardized using criteria developed by IES.

For measure 4.1.1, the 2004 estimate is based on the IES newly funded proposals. The scores of one reviewer were extreme outliers—greater than 3.8 standard deviations below the average of the other 12 reviewers. If these scores were removed, the percentage of projects deemed to be of high quality would be 70 percent. In the future, if the average ratings of a reviewer constitute extreme outliers, these scores will be removed.

For measure 4.1.2, no pertinent publications were released in 2003 or 2004.

**Target Context.** The Department modified the target for measure 4.1.1 in December 2003 to be more reasonable based on trend data.

**Additional Information.** Data on OSEP projects will be available in January 2005.

Independent review panels convened by the Department to evaluate the quality of new IES and OSEP projects and publications are independent of peer review panels that oversee the selection of projects. These panels are convened after the close of the fiscal year to review projects and publications of the prior year.

The Department's National Institute of Disability and Rehabilitation Research (NIDRR) also uses independent panels of experts to conduct reviews of eligible projects under its largest three funding mechanisms. Of those reviewed, 54 percent of 2002 projects and 67 percent of 2003 projects were deemed effective. Data for 2004 are pending and will be available in January 2005. NIDRR is currently developing a new annual performance assessment process to correct the limitations of the current process.

<b>4.1.3</b> Of new IES and OSEP research and evaluation projects funded by the Department to conduct research on or to evaluate programs, practices, and policies designed to improve student learning and achievement, the percentage of projects addressing causal questions that employ randomized experimental designs	
Fiscal Year	Actual
2001	46
2002	78
2003	94
2004	90 (est)
We exceeded our 2004 target of 75.	

est = estimated, preliminary or partial data

<b>4.1.4</b> Of IES and OSEP new research and evaluation publications reporting research on or evaluation of programs, practices, and policies designed to improve student learning and achievement, the percentage of publications addressing causal questions that describe studies that employ randomized experimental designs	
Fiscal Year	Actual
2001	0
2002	100
2003	Not applicable
2004	Not applicable
There were no 2004 publications to review.	

**Source.** Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences (IES).

**Data Quality.** Research staff evaluates all newly funded research proposals. Quality review standards were developed by IES. Each product and proposal is reviewed to determine if the project includes questions of effectiveness (i.e., causal questions) and, if so, whether the project employs randomized experimental designs. Inter-rater reliability checks are completed to ensure the reliability of the data.

For measure 4.1.3, the 2004 estimate is based on the IES newly funded proposals. Office of Special Education Program's proposals have not yet been evaluated. For

measure 4.1.4, no pertinent publications were released for 2003 or 2004.

**Target Context.** The 2004 target for use of randomized experimental design was set based on 2001 data, prior to the availability of subsequent years' data.

**Additional Information.** Remaining 2004 data for measure 4.1.3 will be available in December 2004.

Presence of a causal question is defined as a study in which one variable is hypothesized to affect a second variable.

A randomized experimental design is defined as instances in which there is an experimental treatment group and one or more comparison groups with random assignment of participants to treatment or comparison conditions. If a proposal or publication included a design in which two or more groups of participants were compared but did not explicitly indicate that random assignment procedures would be used, the proposal was recorded as not using a randomized experimental design.

## OBJECTIVE 4.2: RELEVANCE OF RESEARCH

4.2.1 Percentage of new research projects funded by the Department that are deemed to be of high relevance to educational practice as determined by an independent review panel of qualified practitioners	
Fiscal Year	Actual
2001	24
2002	53
2003	48
2004	Target is 75.
We did not meet our 2003 target of 54. Data for 2004 are pending.	

**Source.** Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences (IES), panel reviews.

**Data Quality.** An external panel of qualified practitioners evaluated the relevance of a random sample of newly funded research proposals submitted in 2003 and rated their relevance. The inclusion of only

experienced practitioners and administrators in education and special education on the panel promotes the quality of the data. A total of 29 newly funded 2003 research projects were reviewed by a panel of 14 education practitioners and decision-makers (including principals, superintendents, directors of special education, and chief state school officers). The sample included nine randomly selected projects from the 18 Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) FY 2003 Field Initiated Studies program and 20 of 38 IES projects. For the IES proposals, a stratified random sample was drawn from the seven IES FY 2003 research competitions: (1) Mathematics and Science Education Research Program, (2) Interagency Education Research Initiative Program, (3) Preschool Curriculum Evaluation Research Program, (4) Social and Character Development Research Program, (5) Teacher Quality Research Program, (6) Reading Comprehension Research Program, and (7) Cognition and Student Learning Research Program. Each of the 29 abstracts was randomly assigned to at least three of the 14 reviewers to rate for relevance. By office, 60 percent of IES projects and 22 percent of OSEP projects were rated relevant or better.

**Target Context.** Target performance levels were based on 2001 actual performance, with the goal of increasing to 75 percent by 2004. This target demonstrates recognition that some important research will be funded that may not seem highly relevant to education practitioners and decision-makers at the moment but will make contributions over the long term.

**Additional Information.** Data for 2004 will be available in January 2005.

The independent review panel referenced here is different from the peer review panels that oversee the selection of projects. The independent review panel was convened at the close of the fiscal year to review projects and publications as a way to judge the effectiveness of the Department's quality control mechanisms.

**OBJECTIVE 5.1: COLLEGE ACCESS AND COMPLETION**

<b>5.1.1–5.1.4</b> Percentage of 16- to 24-year-old high school graduates enrolled in college the October following graduation				
<b>Fiscal Year</b>	<b>Overall</b>	<b>White</b>	<b>Black</b>	<b>White-Black Gap</b>
1999	62.9	66.3	58.9	7.4
2000	63.3	65.7	54.9	10.8
2001	61.7	64.2	54.6	9.6
2002	Target is 63.8.	Target is 66.9.	Target is 59.6.	Target is 7.3.
2003	Target is 64.1.	Target is 67.0.	Target is 60.3.	Target is 6.7.
2004	Target is 67.0.	Target is 69.4.	Target is 60.8.	Target is 8.6.
	Data for 2002, 2003, and 2004 are pending.	Data for 2002, 2003, and 2004 are pending.	Data for 2002, 2003, and 2004 are pending.	Data for 2002, 2003, and 2004 are pending.

<b>5.1.5–5.1.9</b> Percentage of 16- to 24-year-old high school graduates enrolled in college the October following graduation					
<b>Fiscal Year</b>	<b>Hispanic</b>	<b>White-Hispanic Gap</b>	<b>Low Income</b>	<b>High Income</b>	<b>Income Gap</b>
1999	42.2	24.1	49.4	76.0	26.6
2000	52.9	12.8	49.7	77.1	27.4
2001	51.7	12.5	43.8	79.8	36.0
2002	Target is 50.0.	Target is 16.9.	Target is 51.5.	Target is 76.9.	Target is 25.4.
2003	Target is 51.5.	Target is 15.5.	Target is 53.5.	Target is 77.0.	Target is 23.5.
2004	Target is 57.5.	Target is 11.9.	Target is 51.0.	Target is 80.0.	Target is 29.0.
	Data for 2002, 2003, and 2004 are pending.	Data for 2002, 2003, and 2004 are pending.	Data for 2002, 2003, and 2004 are pending.	Data for 2002, 2003, and 2004 are pending.	Data for 2002, 2003, and 2004 are pending.

**Source.** Census Bureau, Current Population Survey, October 2001, released in December 2002.

**Data Quality.** Information includes those persons aged 16–24 completing high school in a given year. Actual values are one-year averages calculated from the Current Population Survey. Data are subject to both Census and NCES validation procedures.

**Target Context.** The Department made minor revisions to the 2004 targets in December 2003 based on re-

analysis of 1998–2001 enrollment data.

**Related Information.** The Department of Education's *Condition of Education 2004* is available at <http://nces.ed.gov/pubsearch/pubsinfo.asp?pubid=2004077>.

**Additional Information.** FY 2002 data will be available in late November 2004. FY 2003 data will be available in December 2004. FY 2004 data will be available in December 2005.

<b>5.1.10–5.1.15</b> National percentage of full-time, bachelor's degree-seeking students who graduate from four-year institutions within six years						
<b>Fiscal Year</b>	<b>Overall</b>	<b>White</b>	<b>Black</b>	<b>White-Black Gap</b>	<b>Hispanic</b>	<b>White-Hispanic Gap</b>
1999	53.0	56.0	35.4	20.6	40.9	15.1
2000	52.4	55.4	35.7	19.7	41.5	13.9
2001	Pending; no target	Pending; no target	Pending; no target	Pending; no target	Pending; no target	Pending; no target
2002	<b>54.4</b>	<b>57.2</b>	<b>38.2</b>	<b>19.0</b>	<b>44.8</b>	<b>12.4</b>
2003	<b>54.3</b>	<b>57.3</b>	<b>38.5</b>	<b>18.8</b>	<b>43.5</b>	<b>13.8</b>
2004	Target is 54.0.	Target is 56.8.	Target is 37.4.	Target is 19.4.	Target is 43.2.	Target is 13.6.
	We exceeded our 2002 target of 52.7. We exceeded our 2003 target of 53.1. Data for 2001 and 2004 are pending.	We exceeded our 2002 target of 56.0. We exceeded our 2003 target of 56.1. Data for 2001 and 2004 are pending.	We exceeded our 2002 target of 37.0. We made progress toward our 2003 target of 38.9. Data for 2001 and 2004 are pending.	We met our 2002 target of 19.0. We made progress toward our 2003 target of 17.2. Data for 2001 and 2004 are pending.	We exceeded our 2002 target of 41.0. We exceeded our 2003 target of 42.5. Data for 2001 and 2004 are pending.	We did better than our 2002 target of 15.0. We did not meet our 2003 target of 13.6. Data for 2001 and 2004 are pending.

These measures were first established for FY 2002, so there are no targets for FY 2001.

<b>5.1.16–5.1.21</b> Percentage of full-time, degree- or certificate-seeking students at two-year institutions who graduate, earn a certificate, or transfer from two-year institutions within three years						
<b>Fiscal Year</b>	<b>Overall</b>	<b>White</b>	<b>Black</b>	<b>White-Black Gap</b>	<b>Hispanic</b>	<b>White-Hispanic Gap</b>
1999	34.4	35.3	29.5	5.8	32.5	2.8
2000	32.7	34.0	26.5	7.5	30.1	3.9
2001	Pending; no target	Pending; no target	Pending; no target	Pending; no target	Pending; no target	Pending; no target
2002	<b>29.3</b>	<b>30.7</b>	<b>23.3</b>	<b>7.4</b>	<b>27.0</b>	<b>3.7</b>
2003	<b>30.6</b>	<b>31.7</b>	<b>26.1</b>	<b>5.6</b>	<b>30.1</b>	<b>1.6</b>
2004	Target is 34.0.	Target is 34.5.	Target is 27.3.	Target is 7.2.	Target is 31.1.	Target is 3.4.
	We did not meet our 2002 target of 32.5. We made progress toward our 2003 target of 32.7. Data for 2001 and 2004 are pending.	We did not meet our 2002 target of 34.0. We made progress toward our 2003 target of 34.1. Data for 2001 and 2004 are pending.	We did not meet our 2002 target of 26.3. We made progress toward our 2003 target of 27.0. Data for 2001 and 2004 are pending.	We did better than our 2002 target of 7.7. We did better than our 2003 target of 7.1. Data for 2001 and 2004 are pending.	We did not meet our 2002 target of 30.5. We made progress toward our 2003 target of 30.8. Data for 2001 and 2004 are pending.	We did not meet our 2002 target of 3.5. We did better than our 2003 target of 3.3. Data for 2001 and 2004 are pending.

These measures were first established for FY 2002, so there are not targets for FY 2001.

**Source.** Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics (NCES), Graduation Rate Survey, part of the Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS).

**Data Quality.** Data are subject to NCES validation procedures. Years represent rates of graduation for graduating cohort. For example, the percentage of the 1996 cohort that graduated from a four-year institution by 2002 is reported in 2002; the percentage of the 1999 cohort that graduated, earned a certificate, or transferred from a two-year degree-granting institution by 2002 is reported in 2002.

Although the survey can provide information on whether the students transferred from a two-year school, the data do not distinguish the students who transferred to a four-year school from those who transferred to another two-year school. The reported numbers reflect any student who successfully transferred out of the school within three years.

**Target Context.** The Department made minor revisions to the 2004 targets in December 2003 based upon re-analysis of 1998–2001 graduation and completion data.

**Related Information.** NCES's postsecondary survey site (including IPEDS) is available at <http://nces.ed.gov/surveys/SurveyGroups.asp?Group=2>.

**Additional Information.** Data for 2001 will be available in late November 2004. Data for 2004 will be available in November 2005. Data for 2002 and 2003 were available before data for 2001 because the Graduation Rate Survey is mandated beginning in 2002. Now that the 2002 and 2003 data analysis and release are completed, work is proceeding on the 2001 data.

**OBJECTIVE 5.2: ACCOUNTABILITY OF POSTSECONDARY INSTITUTIONS**

<b>5.2.1</b> Percentage of states and territories submitting HEA Title II reports with all data reported using federally required definitions	
<b>Fiscal Year</b>	<b>Actual</b>
2001	63
2002	80
2003	<b>83</b>
2004	<b>91</b>
We did not meet our 2003 target of 100. Data for 2004 are pending.	

**Source.** Department of Education, Office of Postsecondary Education, Title II Data System.

**Data Quality.** Data are reported to states by institutions. The states compile the data and submit them to the Department.

**Target Context.** The Department modified the 2004 target in December 2003, based on trend data and anticipated improvements based on support services offered by the Department.

**Related Information:** Additional information about Title II can be found at <http://www.title2.org>.

The report *Meeting the Highly Qualified Teachers Challenge: The Secretary's Annual Report on Teacher Quality* can be found at <http://www.title2.org/secReport.htm>.

<b>5.2.2-5.2.4</b> Percentage of institutions of higher education submitting required reports and information on time*			
<b>Fiscal Year</b>	<b>Audit data</b>	<b>Campus crime data</b>	<b>IPEDS data</b>
2004	<b>Not collected</b>	<b>Not collected</b>	<b>Not collected</b>

<b>5.2.5</b> Percentage of OPE grants closed on time*	
<b>Fiscal Year</b>	<b>Actual</b>
2004	<b>Not collected</b>

<b>5.2.6</b> Percentage of IG and GAO audits of OPE activities that are resolved on time*	
<b>Fiscal Year</b>	<b>Actual</b>
2004	<b>Not collected</b>

\*The December 2003 *Interim Adjustments to the Strategic Plan* inadvertently identified measures 5.2.2–5.2.6 as FY 2004 measures; they actually begin as measures in FY 2005.

**OBJECTIVE 5.3: FUNDING POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION**

<b>5.3.1</b> Average national increases in college tuition, adjusted for inflation	
<b>Fiscal Year</b>	<b>Actual</b>
1999	5.4%
2000	4.5%
2001	3.1%
2002	6.4%
2003	<b>6.6%</b>
2004	Target is 5.0%.
We did not meet our 2003 target of 3.0%. Data for 2004 are pending.	

**Source.** Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS), Fall Enrollment Survey and Institutional Characteristics Survey.

**Data Quality.** Survey data are for the entire academic year and reflect average charges paid by students. Tuition and fees were weighted by the number of full-time-equivalent undergraduates but were not adjusted to reflect student residency.

**Target Context.** The Department modified the 2004 target in December 2003 to reflect recent trend data, which indicate that our prior target was not reasonable.

**Related Information.** College Board statistics on increases in tuition costs are available at [http://www.collegeboard.com/prod\\_downloads/press/co st04/041264TrendsPricing2004\\_FINAL.pdf](http://www.collegeboard.com/prod_downloads/press/co st04/041264TrendsPricing2004_FINAL.pdf).

**Additional Information.** Data from IPEDS for 2004 will be available in July 2005.

The College Board also collects tuition cost information and conducts an in-depth analysis annually.

The College Board reported that between the beginning of September 2003 and September 2004, tuition and fees increased by 6.0 percent at four-year private institutions (average \$20,082) and by 10.5 percent at four-year public in-state institutions (average \$5,132). Despite the rising tuition and fees, in *Education Pays 2004*, the College Board stressed that while the cost of college may be imposing to many families, the cost associated with not going to college is likely to be much greater. Median annual earnings for year-round full-time workers with bachelor's degrees are about 62 percent higher than those with only a high school diploma, and those with a master's degree earn nearly twice as much as a high school graduate.

<b>5.3.2 Borrower indebtedness (expressed as average borrower payments) for federal student loans as a percentage of borrower income</b>	
<b>Fiscal Year</b>	<b>Actual</b>
1999	6.5
2000	6.4
2001	6.2
2004	<b>Not collected</b>
We did not collect data for 2004 because borrower indebtedness is no longer a commonly used statistic.	

**Source.** Department of Education, National Student Loan Data System records merged with income data from the Internal Revenue Service (IRS) (analysis conducted by the Department's Policy and Program Studies Service).

**Data Quality.** The Department of the Treasury validates IRS data, and the Office of Federal Student Aid and the reporting state agencies validate National Student Loan Data System data.

**Target Context.** In prior years, the Department considered 10 percent to be the upper limit for an acceptable level of debt. As explained below, this measure is no longer commonly used.

**Related Information.** Information on student aid as compiled by the College Board is available at <http://www.collegeboard.com/press/cost02/html/cost02b.html>.

**Additional Information.** In prior years, the banking community used 10 percent as a barometer for what constituted an acceptable level of debt, and the Department used this measure as well. In recent years, however, the banking community has embraced "credit scoring." We no longer have a meaningful benchmark by which to assess a reasonable debt ratio. This measure addresses only federal loan sources, not taking into account private sources. Thus, we plan to discontinue this measure.

#### OBJECTIVE 5.4: HBCUS, HSIS, AND TCUS

<b>5.4.1 Percentage of HBCUs, HSIs, and TCUs with a positive fiscal balance</b>	
<b>Fiscal Year</b>	<b>Actual</b>
2000	67
2001	71
2002	69
2003	<b>72</b>
2004	Target is 70.
We made progress toward our 2003 target of 79. Data for 2004 are pending.	

HBCUs = Historically Black Colleges and Universities  
 HSIs = Hispanic-Serving Institutions  
 TCUs = Tribal Colleges and Universities

**Source.** Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics (NCES), Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS).

**Data Quality.** Data are self-reported from institutions and estimate the total universe in this measure. Nearly all Historically Black Colleges and Universities, Hispanic-Serving Institutions (HSIs), and Tribal Colleges and Universities participate in the IPEDS Financial Report and are, therefore, represented by the data. The level of Hispanic and low-income student enrollment determines an institution's status as an HSI. These enrollment levels can fluctuate from year to year and cannot be exactly determined from IPEDS enrollment data. However, a reasonable approximation can be based on the IPEDS enrollment data.

**Target Context.** The Department modified the 2004 target in December 2003 because recent decreases in state contributions to higher education have resulted in declines in fiscal balance performance.

**Related Information.** Information on the White House Initiative on Historically Black Colleges and Universities is available at <http://www.ed.gov/about/inits/list/whhbcu/edlite-index.html>.

Information on the White House Initiative on Educational Excellence for Hispanic Americans is available at <http://www.yesican.gov/> and in Spanish at <http://www.yosipuedo.gov>.

The NCES report *Hispanic Serving Institutions Statistical Trends from 1990–1999* is available at <http://nces.ed.gov/pubs2002/2002051.pdf>.

Information on the White House Initiative on Tribal Colleges and Universities is available at <http://www.ed.gov/about/inits/list/whtc/edlite-index.html>.

IPEDS description and data are available at <http://nces.ed.gov/ipeds/>.

**Additional Information.** Data for 2004 will be available in October 2005.

This measure is closely tied to the economy. The financial situation of a school is largely related to the financial situation of the states as well as the financial situation of its graduates, who would make donations to the school.

5.4.2 Percentage of HBCUs, HSIs, and TCUs with evidence of increased technological capacity	
Fiscal Year	Actual
2003	39
2004	Target is 50.
We established a baseline in 2003. Data for 2004 are pending.	

HBCUs = Historically Black Colleges and Universities

HSIs = Hispanic-Serving Institutions

TCUs = Tribal Colleges and Universities

**Data Source.** Department of Education, Institutional Development and Undergraduate Education Service, Annual Performance Report.

**Data Quality.** Data are supplied by institutions, which certify the accuracy of the data. FY 2003 data reported here are a correction to the FY 2003 report, which stated that data had not been collected. However, we are unable to compare to a target for 2003 because the 2003 target was set in terms of an improvement over the 2002 value and we did not collect data for 2002.

**Target Context.** The targets for this measure were developed based on staff experience in administering the program.

**Related Information.** Information on the White House Initiative on Historically Black Colleges and Universities is available at <http://www.ed.gov/about/inits/list/whhbcu/edlite-index.html>.

Information on the White House Initiative on Educational Excellence for Hispanic Americans is available at <http://www.yesican.gov/> and in Spanish at <http://www.yosipuedo.gov>.

The NCES report *Hispanic Serving Institutions Statistical Trends from 1990–1999* is available at <http://nces.ed.gov/pubs2002/2002051.pdf>.

Information on the White House Initiative on Tribal Colleges and Universities is available at <http://www.ed.gov/about/inits/list/whtc/edlite-index.html>.

**Additional Information.** Data for 2004 will be available in September 2005.

## OBJECTIVE 5.5: LITERACY AND EMPLOYMENT OF AMERICAN ADULTS

5.5.1 Percentage of employed persons served by state VR agencies who obtain competitive employment	
Fiscal Year	Actual
1999	83.1
2000	86.0
2001	87.6
2002	92.7
2003	93.9
2004	Target is 86.8.
Data for 2004 are pending.	

VR = Vocational Rehabilitation

This measure was significantly modified in FY 2004.

**Source.** Department of Education, FY 2003 Rehabilitation Services Administration (RSA) 911 Case Service Report (July 2004).

**Final Report on Related FY 2003 Measure.** For FY 2003, the Department included a measure of the percentage of all consumers served by Vocational Rehabilitation (VR) agencies who obtained employment. At the time of the *FY 2003 Performance and Accountability Report*, the results for this measure were pending. The FY 2003 results for this measure were 58.4 percent, which did not meet the target of 63.5 percent.

**Data Quality.** For FY 2004, the Department replaced the measure that reported on all employment for VR consumers with the current measure, which reports only on competitive employment.

Data for this measure are derived from the RSA-911 Case Service Report. This report is submitted by the 80 state vocational rehabilitation agencies to the Rehabilitation Services Administration (RSA) by November 30 of each year. Editing takes place through the use of a computer program that is provided to each agency. RSA's expectation is that each agency will edit the data prior to submitting them; however, RSA staff edit each state agency's data submission, checking for omissions, validity errors, and issues of reasonableness to provide the state agency with feedback regarding errors and questions that need to be addressed. After all agencies' data are corrected to the extent possible, a national database is created, which provides the information for this measure.

**Target Context.** In December 2003, when the Department replaced the prior measure with the current one, trend data were recomputed, but the target was inadvertently not adjusted. However we will compare FY 2004 results, when they are available, with the target previously set for a parallel program-level measure.



**Related Information.** Vocational rehabilitation agency publications and reports are available at <http://www.ed.gov/about/offices/list/osers/rsa/research.html>.

**Additional Information.** Data for 2004 will be available in April 2005.

In recent years, RSA has placed increased emphasis on working with state agencies to assist individuals with disabilities to achieve high-quality employment outcomes. Therefore, competitive employment—that is, employment at or above the minimum wage in integrated settings—has become increasingly valued. Thus, rather than looking at the numbers achieving employment, RSA is more interested in examining the numbers of individuals who achieve competitive employment outcomes. To this end, RSA has promulgated regulations that eliminate extended employment—i.e., employment in segregated settings in which individuals may be paid less than the minimum wage—as a successful program outcome.

Over the past year, RSA has decided to evaluate state agency performance rather than outcomes for individuals with disabilities. Therefore, for FY 2005, the Department plans to change this measure to assess the percentage of general and combined state agencies that assist at least 72.6 percent of individuals with employment outcomes to achieve competitive employment and the percentage of state agencies for the blind that assist at least 50 percent of individuals with employment outcomes to achieve competitive employment. This measure was derived from the Evaluation Standards and Performance Indicators established by section 106 of the Rehabilitation Act.

#### **OBJECTIVE 5.6: CAPACITY OF U.S. POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION INSTITUTIONS TO TEACH WORLD LANGUAGES, AREA STUDIES, AND INTERNATIONAL STUDIES**

<b>5.6.1</b> Percentage of international postsecondary consortia projects that are institutionalized after the conclusion of the grant period	
<b>Fiscal Year</b>	<b>Actual</b>
2004	Target is 44.
Data for 2004 are pending.	

This measure was first established for FY 2004.

**Source.** Department of Education, Office of Postsecondary Education, Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education, internal data.

**Data Quality.** Data are reviewed for accuracy by Department of Education staff.

**Target Context.** The Department established an ambitious target based upon current program experience.

**Related Information.** Information about the Consortia Programs can be found at <http://www.ed.gov/about/offices/list/oep/fipse/index.html>.

**Additional Information.** Data will be available in December 2004 for the first of the consortia programs.

<b>5.6.2</b> Number of foreign-language course offerings by Title VI institutions	
<b>Fiscal Year</b>	<b>Actual</b>
2004	<b>24,737</b>
We established a baseline in 2004.	

This measure was first established for FY 2004.

**Source.** Department of Education, International Education Programs Service, Evaluation of Exchange, Language, International and Area Studies (EELIAS) Performance Report Program Data.

**Data Quality.** Grantees submit program performance data annually. The data are self-reported but subject to program staff reviews for accuracy.

**Target Context.** Because trend data were not available, the Department is using 2004 data to establish a baseline.

**Related Information.** See <http://www.ed.gov/about/offices/list/oep/iegps/index.html>.

<b>5.6.3</b> Percentage of Title VI graduates who find employment in higher education, government service, and national security	
<b>Fiscal Year</b>	<b>Actual</b>
2004	Target is to set a baseline.
Data for 2004 are pending.	

This measure was first established for FY 2004.

**Source.** Department of Education, International Education Programs Service, EELIAS Performance Report Program Data.

**Data Quality.** Grantees submit program performance data annually. The data are self-reported but subject to program staff reviews for accuracy.

**Target Context.** Because trend data were not available, the Department will use 2004 data to establish a baseline.

**Related Information.** See <http://www.ed.gov/about/offices/list/oep/iegps/index.html>.

**Additional Information.** Data for 2004 will be available in April 2005.

<b>5.6.4</b> Number of comprehensive instructional resources (assessments, publications, curricular materials, etc.) produced at Title VI institutions of higher education	
<b>Fiscal Year</b>	<b>Actual</b>
2004	Target is to set a baseline.
Data for 2004 are pending.	

This measure was first established for FY 2004.

**Source.** Department of Education, International Education Programs Service, EELIAS Performance Report Program Data.

**Data Quality.** Grantees submit program performance data annually. The data are self-reported but subject to program staff reviews for accuracy.

**Target Context.** Because trend data were not available, the Department will use 2004 data to establish a baseline.

**Related Information.** See <http://www.ed.gov/about/offices/list/oep/iegps/index.html>.

**Additional Information.** Data for 2004 will be available in April 2005.

5.6.5 Number of K–12 teachers trained through the Title VI and Fulbright-Hays Programs	
Fiscal Year	Actual
2004	Target is to set a baseline.
Data for 2004 are pending.	

This measure was first established for FY 2004.

**Source.** Department of Education, International Education Programs Service, EELIAS Performance Report Program Data.

**Data Quality.** Grantees submit program performance data annually. The data are self-reported but subject to program staff reviews for accuracy.

**Target Context.** Because we do not have trend data, the target for FY 2004 is to establish a baseline.

**Related Information.** See <http://www.ed.gov/about/offices/list/oep/iegps/index.html>.

**Additional Information.** Data for 2004 will be available in April 2005.

## OBJECTIVE 6.1: FINANCIAL INTEGRITY AND MANAGEMENT AND INTERNAL CONTROLS

6.1.1 Achievement of an unqualified audit opinion	
Fiscal Year	Actual
1999	Qualified
2000	Qualified
2001	Qualified
2002	Unqualified
2003	Unqualified
2004	Unqualified
We met our 2004 target of an unqualified audit opinion.	

**Source.** Independent Auditors' FY 2004 Financial Statement and Audit Report.

**Data Quality.** Independent auditors follow professional standards and conduct the audit under the oversight of the Office of Inspector General.

**Target Context.** Prior to FY 2002, the Department had not received an unqualified audit opinion since FY 1997. Receiving and maintaining an unqualified audit opinion was one of Secretary Paige's top management priorities when taking office in 2001. The Department was able to achieve an unqualified audit opinion in FY 2002 and plans to maintain this status in the future.

**Related Information.** The *FY 2003 Performance and Accountability Report* is available at <http://www.ed.gov/about/reports/annual/2003report/index.html>.

The *FY 2004 Performance and Accountability Report* is available at <http://www.ed.gov/about/reports/annual/2004report/index.html>.

**Additional Information.** The Department received its third consecutive clean financial statement opinion in FY 2004. This recognition by external sources provides assurance that the Department is able to produce timely and accurate financial information. It also demonstrates that the Department can meet mandated deadlines with reliable information and Department management can effectively rely on the information to assess performance and appropriately allocate resources.

6.1.2 Number of audit recommendations from prior year financial statement audits remaining open	
Fiscal Year	Actual
1999	48
2000	18
2001	19
2002	8
2003	3
2004	1
We did better than our 2004 target of 2.	

**Source.** Department of Education, Audit Accountability and Resolution Tracking System.

**Data Quality.** Data are drawn from the electronic system identified above. Managers with responsibility for the affected areas provide updates to the status of all open audit recommendations in this system. When the corrective actions have been implemented and the manager determines that the recommendation has been completed, the Office of the Chief Financial Officer makes a final determination that the recommendation can be closed.

**Target Context.** The Department has made a concerted effort over the last several years to reduce the number of recommendations made in the financial

statement audit and to implement the audit recommendations from prior year financial statement audits. Once the recommendations are known each year, the Department not only prepares a corrective action plan, but also prepares a work plan for how to complete each of the corrective actions. The targets for completing recommendations are then set based on those work plans.

**Additional Information.** During FY 2004, the Department completed the three remaining open recommendations from the FY 2002 financial statement audit and seven of the eight recommendations from the FY 2003 financial statement audit.

Examples of significant achievements resulting from closure of these audit recommendations include the following:

Established a Credit Reform Workgroup with Office of Postsecondary Education, Office of the Chief Financial Officer, Office of Federal Student Aid, and Budget Service representatives, who meet monthly to examine credit reform issues.

Revised the business process for developing, documenting, reviewing, and achieving consensus on key credit reform assumptions.

Reviewed current student loan assumptions to ensure that they reflect the best available information regarding the effect of loan consolidations, income contingent loan repayment terms, and fixed-rate consolidation offers.

Developed simplified cash flow analysis based on major assumptions to validate and support credit reform modeling techniques.

6.1.3 Number or percentage of performance-based contract actions		
Fiscal Year	Actual Number	Actual Percentage
1999	72	
2000	110	
2001	414	
2002		44
2003		45
2004		47.5
We exceeded our 2004 target of 45.		

6.1.4 Percentage of eligible dollars in performance-based contract actions	
Fiscal Year	Actual
1999	20
2000	43
2001	52
2002	59
2003	60
2004	67
We exceeded our 2004 target of 60.	

**Source.** Department of Education, Central Automated Processing System (EDCAPS) and Federal Procurement Data System.

**Data Quality.** FY 2004 data are based on contract actions taken between October 1, 2003, and August 31, 2004. Data are drawn from Department systems. The Department began computing the percentage of actions in 2002. Prior data are available only for the number of actions. Contract dollars include only new contracts and modifications to existing Performance-Based Service Contracting contracts awarded in the year identified.

**Target Context.** The targets were initially based on the governmentwide objective to apply performance-based contracting to at least 50 percent of annual acquisition dollars by FY 2005. Since the Department has exceeded the governmentwide target for percentage of dollars awarded through performance-based contracts, the Department now bases its targets on an analysis of the type of work to be conducted by the Department and of that work, the percentage of the work that can be achieved through a performance-based contract.

**Additional Information.** Of 1,173 contract transactions, 557 (47.5 percent) were performance based. Of \$1.281 billion spent on contracts, \$858 million was spent on performance-based contracts.

Since FY 2001, the Department has consistently exceeded the governmentwide objective to apply performance-based contracting to at least 50 percent of its annual acquisition dollars. The Department is also improving the performance measures being used in these contracts to focus on more challenging results.

6.1.5 Percentage of erroneous payments	
Fiscal Year	Actual
2003	Set benchmark of 2.5.
2004	Target is less than 2.5.
Data for 2004 are pending.	

**Source.** Department of Education, Office of the Chief Financial Officer.

**Data Quality.** The Department is in the process of creating a risk model to determine the attributes that

may lead to erroneous payments to or by a recipient of grant funds. The data model will be completed by December 2004.

**Target Context.** Based on OMB's guidance for the implementation of Public Law (PL) 107-300, the Improper Payments Information Act of 2002, significant erroneous payments are defined as annual erroneous payments in a program exceeding both 2.5 percent of program payments and \$10 million. Based on this definition, the Department determined that using 2.5 percent as the baseline for erroneous payments was the most pragmatic and efficient means to obtain a starting point. The Department is not able to provide more specific targets until additional analysis is done and trend data become available.

**Related Information.** OMB guidance on implementing the Improper Payments Information Act of 2002 can be found at <http://www.whitehouse.gov/omb/memoranda/m03-13.html>.

**Additional Information.** The percentage of erroneous payments for FY 2004 will be available in January 2005.

In addition to creating a risk model to determine erroneous payments in the Department's grant programs, the Department uses data mining (an analysis of existing data to identify patterns) to identify potential misuse/abuse of both purchase and travel cards. Software applications are used to seek and identify weekend purchases, inappropriate purchases, and use of the travel card and/or ATM withdrawals when employees are not in travel status. In addition, the span of control for purchase cards was reduced; travel card limits were lowered across the board; and travel cards that have not been used in more than one year are being deactivated. The Department has also entered into a recovery-auditing contract, which is reviewing all vendor payments back to FY 1998. The contractor will receive 16 percent of any erroneous payments actually recovered. The Department expects its first report on the extent of vendor erroneous payments in September 2004.

6.1.6–6.1.7 Federal administrative analysis per grant transaction		
Fiscal Year	Discretionary Grants	Formula Grants
2003	\$ 6,781	\$ 5,065
2004	\$ 6,507	\$ 5,574
	We did better than our 2004 target of \$8,128.	We did not meet our 2004 target of \$4,065.

**Source.** Department of Education, Budget Formulation Database.

**Data Quality.** The calculation performed by the Department reflects budgetary estimates of the cost per

grant award. The calculation is not limited to a single transaction in the grant award process; it includes time spent on the Planning, Reviewing, and Pre-Award and Award functions of discretionary and formula grants. Also, the calculation does not make a distinction between new awards and continuation awards. Finally, the calculation does not include grants that are provided under the Student Financial Assistance programs.

**Target Context.** FY 2003 was the first time that the Department estimated the cost of awarding grants. Without trend data, the Department is unable to estimate the future targets beyond current levels. As more data become available, the Department will refine its targets.

The 2003 figures reported in the *FY 2003 Performance and Accountability Report* were based on estimates of the number of grants awarded during FY 2003. The 2003 numbers provided above have been recalculated based on the actual number of grants awarded during FY 2003. The 2004 figures provided above were calculated based on the actual number of grants awarded during FY 2004.

**Additional Information.** During FY 2004, the Department expended approximately \$122 million to award 19,965 grants totaling \$44.1 billion. The Department determined that in FY 2004 one full-time equivalent (FTE) produces approximately 30 discretionary grants or 31 formula grants. In FY 2003, the Department determined that one FTE produced approximately 27 discretionary grants or 34 formula grants.

The estimate of discretionary grants produced by one FTE increased primarily because the staff working on grant awards decreased at a greater rate (16 percent) than the decrease in awards (10 percent). The estimate of formula grants produced by one FTE decreased primarily because the staff working on grant awards increased at a greater rate (11 percent) than the increase in the number of grants (3 percent). The Department is continuing its efforts to streamline the grant award process for both discretionary and formula grants and expects to take advantage of the governmentwide grants.gov initiative to further reduce the cost of awarding grants.

6.1.8 Timeliness of major account reconciliations, expressed as the number of days after month end	
Fiscal Year	Actual
2004	15 (est)
We did better than our 2004 target of 30.	

est = estimated, preliminary, or partial data  
This measure was first established for FY 2004.

**Source.** Department of Education, Internal System Reports.

**Data Quality.** Data are based on reconciliation efforts during March through August 2004. Internal quality control and auditing procedures are followed to ensure that the data are correct.

**Target Context.** The Department aligned its target with the governmentwide accelerated audit reporting requirements. Federal agencies must finalize their financial audit statements within 45 days of year end.

**Additional Information.** For March through August 2004, the Office of the Chief Financial Officer completed *all* major account reconciliations by the 15th of each month, with most of the reconciliations being completed between the 10th and the 13th of the month.

## OBJECTIVE 6.2: MANAGEMENT OF HUMAN CAPITAL

6.2.1 Percentage of principal offices that have identified recruitment needs in their principal office recruitment plan	
Fiscal Year	Actual
2003	89
2004	<b>94</b>
We made progress toward our 2004 target of 95.	

**Source.** Department of Education, Office of Management (OM), Human Resources Service, analysis of 2004 recruitment plans submitted as of July 31, 2004.

**Data Quality.** The calculation is based on the percentage of offices that identified recruitment needs. Offices undergoing major reorganizations are excluded from the calculation.

**Target Context.** The Department expects *all* offices to develop recruitment plans that help them focus on skill gaps that may result from vacancies in critical positions.

**Additional Information.** The Department made progress on the completion of recruitment plans. Seventeen of 18 offices have recruitment plans; one office is currently completing its recruitment plan.

Two offices, the Office of the Deputy Secretary (ODS) and the Office of the Under Secretary (OUS), are currently undergoing major reorganizations and will complete recruitment plans after implementation of the reorganizations. Both offices have been excluded from the calculation this year, but will be included next year.

6.2.2 Percentage of principal offices that are taking actions to fill critical positions with needed skills	
Fiscal Year	Actual
2004	<b>50</b>
We made progress toward our 2004 target of 60.	

**Source.** Department of Education, Office of Management (OM), Human Resources Service, analysis of FY 2003 recruitment plans.

**Data Quality.** The calculation is based on the percentage of offices that took action to fill critical positions identified in the current year recruitment plan. Only offices that identified recruitment needs in their recruitment plans are included in the calculation. For an office to meet the “taking action” criteria, it must complete 75 percent of the planned actions regarding critical vacancies identified in its recruitment plan. The 75 percent threshold was set to promote planning for critical vacancies and allow for changes that offices and managers need to make to effectively and efficiently manage their human capital resources.

**Target Context.** The Department expects *all* offices to take action to fill critical positions. The FY 2004 target of 60 percent was set prior to establishing a baseline. Improvement is expected in the second year of recruitment planning (i.e., FY 2005).

**Additional Information.** Eight of the 19 offices that submitted recruitment plans in FY 2003 had critical vacancies identified in their office recruitment plan. Four of these eight offices completed the planned actions detailed in their recruitment plans. In an effort to increase the number of offices that are completing their planned actions, human resource specialists are meeting with managers who are hiring to provide individual assistance, such as assistance in developing quality recruitment announcements.

While offices that had no critical vacancies identified in their recruitment plans were not included in the calculation, we consider these offices to be acting in accordance with their recruitment plans.

6.2.3 Percentage of performance, cash, and time-off awards that are given to employees with ratings in the top three rating levels in the EDPAS system	
Fiscal Year	Actual
2003	100
2004	<b>100</b>
We met our 2004 target of 100.	

EDPAS = Education Department Performance Appraisal System

**Source.** Department of Education, Federal Personnel and Payroll System (FPPS), Education Department Performance Appraisal System (EDPAS), ratings of record and award data.

**Data Quality.** Data reflect awards granted during FY 2004.

**Target Context.** It is the Department’s expectation that employees performing quality work at or above the Successful level may receive awards. Employees performing below the Successful level are not expected to receive awards.

**Additional Information.** Of 3,238 awards, 3,232 (99.8 percent, which was rounded to 100 percent) were given to employees who were rated successful

or higher. No awards were given to employees rated at the unacceptable level. Six awards went to employees rated minimally successful.

This measure will be modified in the future. It will become part of an index of quality human capital performance management activities that measures the Department's focus on ensuring clarity of results in performance plans, differentiating performance through fair and accurate evaluations, and paying for exceptional performance. With regard to paying for exceptional performance, the Department will begin measuring the percentage of awards paid to employees with the highest performance rating (i.e., outstanding).

6.2.4 Percentage of personnel in the lowest two EDPAS rating levels who have performance improvement activities under way	
Fiscal Year	Actual
2003	55
2004	75
We exceeded our 2004 target of 70.	

EDPAS = Education Department Performance Appraisal System

**Source.** Department of Education, Federal Personnel and Payroll System (FPPS), and data submitted by principal offices.

**Data Quality.** Data are based on the performance period ending April 30, 2004.

**Target Context.** The Department expects that supervisors will take appropriate action to support the improvement of personnel who have less than fully satisfactory performance ratings. The target represents a high level of improvement activities; with only 30 percent or less of affected employees not participating in performance improvement activities because they are involved in other actions such as retirement, removal, reassignment, or extended leave.

**Additional Information.** As of August 17, 2004, the Federal Personnel and Payroll System identified 75 employees with ratings of Minimally Satisfactory or Unacceptable. Two of these employees have since left the Department. Of the 73 remaining employees, 55 (75 percent) now have performance improvement activities under way. In 15 of the remaining 18 cases, supervisors of the impacted employees have been contacted and informed of their obligation to withhold within-grade increases and to improve employee performance. Improvements are to be made through development of Individual Development Plans, training, counseling, and/or closer supervision.

6.2.5 Percentage of EDPAS employees who have documented ratings of record in FPPS within 90 days of the close of the rating cycle	
Fiscal Year	Actual
2003	86
2004	92
We exceeded our 2004 target of 80.	

EDPAS = Education Department Performance Appraisal System

**Source.** Department of Education, Federal Personnel and Payroll System (FPPS) ratings for the Education Department Performance Appraisal System (EDPAS).

**Data Quality.** Data reflect information in the Federal Personnel and Payroll System as of July 29, 2004, and is based on the rating period beginning May 1, 2003, and ending April 30, 2004.

**Target Context.** The target reflects the Department's high expectation that managers will hold employees accountable for their performance and make meaningful distinctions in performance using the EDPAS appraisal system. It is based on historic information regarding supervisory participation in the automated performance appraisal data system.

**Additional Information.** As of July 29, 2004, 3,774 of 4,122 eligible employees (92 percent) had been evaluated and had received performance ratings that had been entered into the Federal Personnel and Payroll System within 90 days of the close of the rating cycle.

6.2.6 Number of business functions reviewed for strategic sourcing	
Fiscal Year	Actual
2004	8
We met our 2004 target of 8.	

This measure was significantly modified for FY 2004.

**Source.** Department of Education, Office of the Chief Financial Officer.

**Data Quality.** The number of reviews is based on reviews conducted under the direction of the Department's Strategic Sourcing Plan.

**Target Context.** Targets were set based on the number of process improvement reviews planned for the year. Future targets will be aligned with the Department's Competitive Sourcing Plan developed in conjunction with the Office of Management and Budget.

**Additional Information.** Reviews of the following business functions were initiated during FY 2004:

**System Development Life Cycle (SDLC)—** SDLC refers to the coordination of activities associated with the implementation of information technology systems from conception through disposal. This includes the related

activities/processes that impact system implementation (e.g., capital planning and investment control, enterprise architecture, procurement, and information assurance).

**IT Asset Management (ITAM)**—ITAM refers to the function that tracks equipment through its entire life cycle. The ITAM process is used to procure, receive, and deliver inventory and dispose of IT assets.

**Record Retention & Management (RM)**—Records contain information and are a component of all business processes and provide the Department with the ability to conduct daily operations, ensure accountability, and mitigate risk. RM is the business function by which the Department accounts for and effectively uses its information.

**Operational Efficiencies**—Desktop & Telecom (OE Desktop)—OE Desktop refers to the processes by which resources are deployed through the Help Desk to respond to EDNET account user desktop and telecom issues. The Desktop and Telecom processes enable the Department's daily operations by ensuring the proper functionality of IT equipment and resources.

**Operational Efficiencies Server (OE Server)**—OE Server refers to the process by which the Department controls and manages the acquisition and maintenance of servers.

**Information Collection (IC)**—IC refers to the coordination of the activities associated with the design, collection, analysis, and reporting of information. Information collection clearance is classified by the Office of Management and Budget under seven purposes: (1) application for benefits, (2) program evaluation, (3) general purpose statistics, (4) audit, (5) program planning or management, (6) research, and (7) regulatory or compliance.

**Web site Operations (WO)**—WO refers to the back-end support necessary to maintain Web sites, including backup and recovery (system administration). WO is broken down into four distinct categories: policy, software licensing, support staff, and hardware/software.

**Grant Competition Logistics**—Grant Competition Logistics refers to the work needed to identify, secure, and pay peer reviewers. It also includes preparing webcasts and conference calls to answer applicant questions and provide reviewer orientation, drafting project abstracts for projects selected for funding, and preparing unfunded applications for archiving.

### OBJECTIVE 6.3: INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY

6.3.1 Percentage of grant programs providing online application capability	
Fiscal Year	Actual
2000	5
2001	20
2002	29
2003	57
2004	77
We exceeded our 2004 target of 65.	

**Source.** Office of the Chief Financial Officer, Grant Administration and Payment System (GAPS).

**Data Quality.** The data are based on discretionary grant programs.

**Target Context.** The FY 2004 target was based on trend data from previous years. Subsequent targets will be aligned with the Department's plan to participate in the governmentwide grants.gov initiative.

**Related Information.** Information regarding the governmentwide grants.gov initiative can be found at <http://www.grants.gov/>.

**Additional Information.** In FY 2004, 122 of the 158 (77 percent) discretionary grant competitions provided an electronic application.

During FY 2004, the total number of e-applications increased by 47 percent over FY 2003 figures. The increase has resulted, in part, from the Department's goal to provide applicants the opportunity to apply for *all* discretionary grant programs electronically. In fact, in FY 2004, several program offices used electronic applications for nearly all of their discretionary grant competitions.

6.3.2 Percentage of currently identified Tier 3 and 4 systems that complete Certification and Accreditation	
Fiscal Year	Actual
2004	84.6
We made progress toward our 2004 target of 100.	

This measure was first established for FY 2004.

6.3.3 Percentage of currently identified Tier 1 and 2 systems that complete Certification and Accreditation	
Fiscal Year	Actual
2003	10
2004	96.7
We exceeded our 2004 target of 50.	

**Source.** Department of Education, Office of the Chief Information Officer, program files.

**Data Quality.** The Department recently refined its system inventory process based on final National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST) guidance

(Special Publication 800-60). As a result, the number of Tier 3 and 4 systems has been reduced from 18 to 13.

**Target Context.** The Department's target is based on its FY 2004 Federal Information Security Management Act (FISMA) Plan of Action and Milestones.

**Related Information.** Additional information on the certification and accreditation process is available at <http://csrc.nist.gov/sec-cert/ca-process.html>.

**Additional Information.** As a result of the reclassification of systems in accordance with NIST guidance, two systems that had previously been classified as Tier 2 were reclassified as Tier 3 systems. These two systems newly classified as Tier 3 have not completed certification and accreditation. The certification and accreditation of each of these systems will be completed by December 31, 2004.

The Department's Office of Inspector General (OIG) raised two issues concerning certain aspects of the Department's certification and accreditation review process. Specifically, the OIG noted the Department's certification and accreditation process did not thoroughly identify certain residual risks, and that as a result, a potential impact could exist on the risk assertions of some Departmental officials at the time of system certification and accreditation. Additionally, the OIG stated that the Department's certification and accreditation process did not adequately identify the residual risks that Department officials were accepting, and that officials lacked access to information essential for developing and supporting risk assertions at the time of system certification and accreditation. The Department supports the OIG's work in this area, recognizing it helps assure the Department obtains full value from the final scanning portion and the reporting of this review process.

To resolve the two above-referenced issues, the Department decided to validate and enhance several key lower-level processes that support the overall certification and accreditation assertions utilizing Tier 3 and Tier 4 scans. This approach is consistent with best practices and demonstrates our commitment to exercising prudent systems management.

To provide an additional level of assurance, the Department decided to scan all high- and medium-risk systems, and have the raw scan results reviewed by a recognized technical expert. The expert will assure in writing that the reviews completed for all low-, medium-, and high-risk systems meet or exceed federal standards; do not omit any major findings; and provide quality supporting data. Procedures are being developed so that compensating controls and residual system risks are identified for system vulnerabilities that are not fully mitigated. Additionally, Department officials will be fully informed of residual system risks when formally certifying and accrediting systems.

**6.3.4 Percentage of major IT investments that achieve less than a 10% variance of cost goals**

Fiscal Year	Actual
2002	94.4
2003	100
2004	100 (est)
We exceeded our 2003 target of 90 and our 2004 target of 91.	

IT = Information Technology

est = estimated, preliminary or partial data

**6.3.5 Percentage of major IT investments that achieve less than a 10% variance of schedule goals**

Fiscal Year	Actual
2002	83.3
2003	96.2
2004	90.5 (est)
We exceeded our 2003 target of 90. We did not meet our 2004 target of 91.	

IT = Information Technology

est = estimated, preliminary, or partial data

**Source.** Department of Education, Office of the Chief Information Officer, Earned Value Management System Workbook.

**Data Quality.** The FY 2004 data are based on information as of July 31, 2004. The data are collected as part of the Information Technology (IT) Investment Management process Select and Control phases. Project managers provide cost and schedule information for their development milestones and operational expenditures. The project managers formulate estimates of remaining work based on actual costs to date, the percentage of milestones completed, their own knowledge of the initiative, and contractor feedback where applicable.

**Target Context.** The Department's targets are in line with the governmentwide expectations set through the *President's Management Agenda*.

**Additional Information.** All of the Department's major information technology systems were within 10 percent of planned costs for FY 2003 and 2004.

As of September 30, 2003, only one of the Department's major IT investments had schedule variances in excess of 10 percent:

ELoans had a schedule variance of 36.71 percent.

As of July 31, 2004, two of the Department's major IT investments had schedule variances in excess of 10 percent:

Common Origination and Disbursement had a schedule variance of 16.98 percent.

Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) had a schedule variance of 96.59 percent.



The Department will continue to work with project managers to ensure that all available resources are used to ensure projects remain on schedule.

6.3.6 Percentage of completed FISMA Plan of Actions and Milestones	
Fiscal Year	Actual
2004	93.3 (est)
We exceeded our 2004 target of 55.	

FISMA = Federal Information Security Management Act

est = estimated, preliminary, or partial data

This measure was first established for FY 2004.

**Source.** Federal Information Security Management Act (FISMA) Plan of Action and Milestones Database.

**Data Quality.** The data are based on progress as of September 1, 2004.

**Target Context.** As of fourth quarter FY 2002, the Department had more than 1,500 identified Federal Information Security Management Act weaknesses. The Department's FY 2004 target is based on trend data and work plans established to correct all identified weaknesses.

**Additional Information.** At the beginning of FY 2004, the Department had 655 identified Federal Information Security Management Act weaknesses that had not been addressed. As of September 1, 2004, the Department has only 44 outstanding weaknesses.

#### OBJECTIVE 6.4: STUDENT FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS

6.4.1 Student Financial Assistance programs will leave the GAO high risk list and will not return	
Fiscal Year	Actual
2002	Completed 94% of the High Risk Plan
2003	The audit opinion is clean; SFA programs remained on the GAO high risk list.
2004	<b>The audit opinion is clean; the Department addressed 97% of audit recommendations and met integration goals in the FY 2004 FSA Performance Plan.</b>
We met our 2004 target of a clean audit opinion. We exceeded our 2004 target of completing 95% of audit recommendations. We met our integration goals in the FY 2004 FSA Performance Plan.	

FSA = Office of Federal Student Aid

SAF = Student Financial Assistance Programs

GAO = Government Accountability Office

**Source.** Department of Education, Office of Federal Student Aid (FSA) High Risk Plan and progress reports.

Independent Auditors' FY 2004 Financial Statement and Audit Report.

**Data Quality.** Independent auditors follow professional standards and conduct the audit under the oversight of the Office of Inspector General. In addition, internal quality control procedures are followed to ensure that the data are correct.

**Target Context.** The Government Accountability Office's (GAO) next release of its high risk list is planned for January 2005. The Department's targets are based on leaving the list as of January 2005.

**Additional Information.** The Department and FSA each received a clean opinion on their financial statements for FY 2002, FY 2003, and FY 2004. The clean opinions are important milestones in the Department's efforts toward creating a permanent culture of accountability and are crucial to FSA's efforts to have the Student Financial Assistance (SFA) programs removed from GAO's High Risk List.

GAO reviews the programs it designates as high risk on a biennial basis. The past assessment was conducted in FY 2002 with publication in January 2003. The most recent assessment opportunity occurred in FY 2004 with publication of the final report in January 2005. FSA has made considerable progress in FY 2004 in building on its foundation for management. Improvements have been made in financial management, in program integrity, and in the strategic management of human capital. In addition, FSA is improving its management of information technology resources to improve services for customers and partners and is moving forward with its modernization of its programs to improve their integrity. FSA has worked with GAO staff to ensure that they are informed of our progress toward resolving Department management issues and sustaining improvement in our programs.

6.4.2 Default recovery rate in percent (percentage of FSA's collections, excluding consolidations)	
Fiscal Year	Actual
1999	8.0
2000	7.5
2001	7.8
2002	7.6
2003	9.5
2004	<b>10.1</b>
We exceeded our 2004 target of 9.5.	

FSA = Office of Federal Student Aid

6.4.3 Overall default recovery rate (percentage of FSA and GAs' collections excluding consolidations)	
Fiscal Year	Actual
2004	<b>11.2</b>
We exceeded our 2004 target of 11.0.	

FSA = Office of Federal Student Aid

GAs = Guaranty Agencies

This measure was first established for FY 2004.

**Source.** Department of Education, Debt Collection Management Systems (DCMS) Management Information System (MIS) reports.

**Data Quality.** Internal quality control and auditing procedures are followed to ensure that the data are correct.

**Target Context.** Targets are based on trend data and performance measures established for private collection agencies providing debt collection services to the Department.

6.4.4–6.4.6 Percentage of Pell Grants erroneous payments			
Fiscal Year	Overpayments	Underpayments <sup>1</sup>	Erroneous Payments <sup>2</sup>
2001	3.4		
2002	3.3		
2003	3.1		4.9
2004	2.8	1.8	4.5
	We did better than our 2004 target of 3.1.	We met our 2004 target of 1.8.	We did better than our 2004 target of 4.9.

<sup>1</sup>This measure was first established for FY 2004.

<sup>2</sup>This measure was first established for FY 2003.

**Source.** Analysis of sampled Internal Revenue Service income data compared to data reported on the Department of Education's Free Application for Federal Student Aid (FAFSA) reported by the Office of Federal Student Aid (FSA) and the Common Origination and Disbursement (COD) system.

**Data Quality.** The overpayment measure is determined by dividing the estimated dollar amount of overpayments by the total dollar value of Pell Grants awarded in academic year 2003–04. The underpayment measure is determined by dividing the estimated dollar amount of underpayments by the total dollar value of Pell Grants awarded in academic year 2003–04. The erroneous payments measure is determined by totaling the dollar amount of estimated overpayments and underpayments and dividing by the total dollar value of Pell Grants awarded in academic year 2003–04.

Overpayment and underpayment percentages are rounded. The actual percentage for overpayments is 2.75 percent, and the actual percentage for underpayments is 1.75 percent.

**Target Context.** Targets are based on trend data and were established in an effort to meet the governmentwide target of 2.5 percent. However, until FSA has the statutory authority to use IRS data matching, the governmentwide target of 2.5 percent cannot be met.

**Related Information.** Information on the Improper Payments Information Act of 2002 can be found at <http://www.whitehouse.gov/omb/memoranda/m03-13-attach.pdf>.

**Additional Information.** Based on recent estimates, federal agencies make more than \$35 billion in improper payments each year. An improper payment occurs when federal funds go to the wrong recipient, the recipient receives the incorrect amount of funds, or the

recipient uses the funds in an improper manner.

Eliminating such payments is central to efforts to improve financial performance governmentwide, enhance the integrity of federal programs, and ensure that limited federal resources are used for their intended purpose. The Improper Payments Information Act (IPIA) of 2002 establishes a framework for improved performance on the measurement and reduction of improper payments.

FSA has implemented numerous strategies for reducing erroneous payments in the Federal Pell Grant Program. We continue to use applicant data from the Central Processing System (CPS), Pell payment data from the Common Origination and Disbursement (COD) system, and IRS data to refine and improve our verification selection criteria to better identify applicants who are likely to have made income-reporting errors on their Free Application for Federal Student Aid that would result in significant overawards in the Pell Grant Program. In addition, we continue to review management information system reports, as well as customized queries of the Central Processing System, to identify and analyze fields on the application that are frequently corrected and, therefore, potentially most error prone. In combination with these efforts, we continue to conduct usability testing on the application form to identify questions that applicants and their families have difficulty understanding. These questions have been reworded on the 2004–05 application to be clearer and, therefore, easier for applicants to answer accurately. We have also added additional logic to our Web applications that is designed to detect and point out to applicants potential mistakes before application data are transmitted to the Central Processing System. FSA has also taken additional steps to inform students and parents who estimate income information on the application that they must compare their answers to their tax returns once they have completed them and to promptly make any necessary changes to their application data to avoid losing or having to repay federal student aid they have received. In May 2004, FSA sent approximately

250,000 e-mail notices to student aid applicants (and their parents) who indicated on their applications that the income information they provided was estimated. The e-mails asked students and parents to update their application income information if it was different than what they reported on their income tax returns. In 2005–06, FSA will expand this initiative to include many more applicants and parents (several million) and will also put in place a system for analyzing the effectiveness of this initiative. We are also continuing to work with OMB and Treasury in support of proposed legislation to revise the IRS Code to authorize the matching of Title IV FSA applicant data to tax return data. In preparation of the passage of this legislation, the office has begun the evaluation of five possible approaches for implementing an income verification match. FSA has ranked the evaluation of the five approaches using several criteria, including overall risk to successful implementation, cost, and customer satisfaction. Once legislation passes, FSA will be in a good position to begin discussions with IRS to implement an income verification match.

<b>6.4.7</b> Timeliness of FSA major system reconciliations to the general ledger, expressed as the number of days after month-end close	
<b>Fiscal Year</b>	<b>Actual</b>
2002	45
2003	Oct–Mar: 35 days Apr–Sept: 24 days
2004	<b>19 days</b>
We did better than our 2004 target of 30 days.	

FSA = Office of Federal Student Aid

**Source.** Department of Education, internal system reports.

**Data Quality.** The FY 2004 data are an average based on data from September 2003 through August 2004. Internal quality control and auditing procedures are followed to ensure that the data are correct.

**Target Context.** The Department aligned its target with the governmentwide accelerated audit reporting requirements. Federal agencies must finalize their financial audit statements within 45 days of year-end.

**Additional Information.** In FY 2004, the Office of Federal Student Aid (FSA) never exceeded the 30-day target. On average, major accounts were reconciled within 19 days.

<b>6.4.8</b> Number of material weaknesses and reportable conditions in FSA financial audit statements	
<b>Fiscal Year</b>	<b>Actual</b>
2000	4
2001	3
2002	2
2003	1
2004	Target is 1.
Data for 2004 are pending.	

FSA = Office of Federal Student Aid

This measure was first established for FY 2004.

**Source.** Independent Auditors' FY 2004 Federal Student Aid Financial Statement and Audit Report.

**Data Quality.** Independent auditors follow professional standards and conduct the audit under the oversight of the Office of Inspector General.

**Target Context.** The Office of Federal Student Aid has made a concerted effort over the last several years to reduce the number of recommendations made in the financial statement audit and to implement the audit recommendations from prior year financial statement audits. The targets reflect efforts to date and trend data.

**Related Information.** The *FY 2003 Performance and Accountability Report* is available at <http://www.ed.gov/about/reports/annual/2003report/index.html>.

The *FY 2004 Performance and Accountability Report* is available at <http://www.ed.gov/about/reports/annual/2004report/index.html>. (Link will be live after November.)

**Additional Information.** Although this performance measure was established for the first time in FY 2004, the number of material weaknesses and reportable conditions from prior FSA financial audit statements is included for reference.

Final information on the number of material weaknesses and reportable conditions in the FY 2004 FSA financial audit statement will be available in November 2004.

<b>6.4.9</b> Integration of FSA processes and systems that work together to support FSA program delivery functions	
<b>Fiscal Year</b>	<b>Actual</b>
2002	100
2003	Met 100% of the targets in FSA's sequencing plan; updated integration plan through the data strategy effort.
2004	<b>Met 100% of targets in FSA's sequencing plan.</b>
We met our 2004 target of achieving 100% of the targets in FSA's sequencing plan.	

FSA = Office of Federal Student Aid

**Source.** Department of Education, internal Office of Federal Student Aid (FSA) progress reports.

**Data Quality.** Internal quality control and auditing procedures are followed to ensure that the data are correct.

**Target Context.** Targets are based on work plans to support FSA's sequencing plan.

**Additional Information.** FSA's sequencing plan enables FSA to make changes to operations, systems, and contracts without adversely affecting day-to-day operations. The sequencing plan identifies milestones for activities that will be completed each fiscal year.

FSA has made considerable progress in furthering its integration goals. Notable accomplishments for FY 2004 include the following:

Implemented Phase One of Common Services for Borrowers (CSB).

Continued development of Enterprise Data Strategy.

Implemented a pilot for the Standard Student Identification Methodology (SSIM).

Implemented the Institutional Student Information Record (ISIR) Data Mart.

Implemented Forms 2000 enhancements.

Developed FSA Security and Privacy Architecture pilot.

Developed Performance Test Architecture to certify new applications or enhancements to applications for deployment in the Virtual Data Center.

Awarded a contract to perform the conceptual design and development of the Integrated Partner Management (IPM) Solution.

Supported the implementation of Oracle Federal Financials Release 11i.

6.4.10-6.4.13 FSA Customer Service (measures of service levels of targeted FSA transactions with public)				
Fiscal Year	FAFSA on the Web	Direct Loan Servicing	Common Origination and Disbursement (COD)	Lender Reporting System (LaRS)
2003	86	77	66	71
2004	81	78	72	73
	We did not meet our 2004 target of 86.	We exceeded our 2004 target of 77.	We exceeded our 2004 target of 70.	We made progress toward meeting our 2004 target of 74.

FSA = Office of Federal Student Aid

FAFSA = Free Application for Federal Student Aid

**Source.** FY 2004 American Customer Satisfaction Index (ACSI) survey.

**Data Quality.** ACSI is indexed from 1 to 100. ACSI provides a national, cross-industry, cross-public, and private sector economic indicator produced by a partnership of the National Quality Research Center (at the University of Michigan Business School), CFI Group, and the American Society for Quality. The ACSI uses a widely accepted methodology to obtain standardized customer satisfaction information.

**Target Context.** Targets are based on trend data.

**Additional Information.** Every year the Office of Federal Student Aid (FSA) conducts customer surveys of its most high-profile, highly used products and services: FAFSA on the Web, Direct Loan Servicing, Common Origination and Disbursement, and the Lender Reporting System.

FSA's ACSI scores (indexed from 1 to 100) are generally good and are in the range of national benchmarks including the national ACSI average score of 74, the federal agency average score of 71, and the banking industry average score of 75.

*FAFSA on the Web* is the Web-based product that applicants complete to determine their eligibility for federal student aid. In FY 2004, about 10.8 million out of a total of 13.5 million applications were filed electronically with slightly over three-quarters using FAFSA on the Web. The FY 2004 FAFSA on the Web ACSI score dropped to an 81 from last year's 86. Customers are reporting lower satisfaction levels across most of the FAFSA on the Web service components; however, some of the biggest changes noted are in customer comparisons of the current service to an "ideal" and "to their expectations." These two factors are critical components in the calculation of the ACSI score. We believe as users continue to become more and more familiar with Web-based applications, we will continue to experience some challenges in these areas. However, FSA plans to further analyze the results of the survey and look for additional opportunities for improvement.

Although our score has declined, the FAFSA on the Web remains a highly rated product, exceeding the scores of the national benchmarks noted above and is on par with the highest rated products within ACSI's E-commerce Index. Additionally, FAFSA on the Web remains one of the highest rated E-government Web

sites. In ACSI's recent E-government survey released in September 2004, only three agencies report higher scores than FSA's FAFSA on the Web and no other e-government Web site in the e-Commerce/Transaction Index reported a higher score.

*Direct Loan Servicing* is the process by which loans are repaid and includes the issuing of monthly statements; collecting of loan balances; and offering customer-service help and web-based help and information. The Direct Loan Servicer is handling about 6.6 million borrower accounts. The FY 2004 Direct Loan Servicing ACSI score is 78, up one point from last year's score of 77. Customers using the electronic debit capabilities to repay their Direct Loans, as well as those receiving paper statements, report extremely high levels of satisfaction with those processes; however, the automated voice response services are rated significantly lower. The ACSI has noted low automated voice response results in many of the industries it measures.

*The Common Origination and Disbursement (COD)* system is the mechanism that schools use to receive and account for federal funds used in the Direct Loan and Pell Grant Programs. More than 5,200 schools participating in the Pell and/or Direct Loan Program used the COD during FY 2004. Altogether, \$25.9 billion in loans and grants were processed through the system. The FY 2004 COD ACSI score of 72 is up six points from last year's 66, and it exceeded the goal of 70 that was set by FSA's Management Team. Specifically, customers noted large improvements in our ability to help them with inquiries and with the accuracy of our data.

*The Lender Reporting System (LaRS)* is the mechanism that lenders and servicers use to receive interest and special allowance payments from the Department on their active Federal Family Education Loan (FFEL) Program loan portfolios. Approximately 3,500 lenders and or their servicers use the LaRS. The overall ACSI score for LaRS is 73, up two points from last year's 71, and just one point shy of FSA's goal of 74. While we continue to receive high marks for our LaRS technical assistance, customers report some issues in navigating the system and in making corrections to previously reported data. The office plans to further analyze the results of the survey and look for additional opportunities for improvement.

## OBJECTIVE 6.5: BUDGET AND PERFORMANCE INTEGRATION

6.5.1 Percentage of Department programs reviewed under the PART process that demonstrate effectiveness (discontinued effective FY 2004)	
Fiscal Year	Actual
2002	22
2003	33
We did not meet our 2003 target of 40.	

PART = Program Assessment Rating Tool

6.5.2 Percentage of Department program dollars associated with programs reviewed under the PART process that demonstrate effectiveness	
Fiscal Year	Actual
2002	55
2003	52
2004	Target is 56.
We did not meet our 2003 target of 60. Data for 2004 are pending.	

PART = Program Assessment Rating Tool

**Source.** Department of Education, analysis of Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART) findings.

**Data Quality.** PART analysis began in 2002 and is conducted annually. Results become available in February of each year, with the release of the President's budget. By February 2004, the Department completed PART reviews of 33 programs. By February 2005, the Department will have completed PART reviews of 60 programs. Over the five-year period 2002 through 2006, the Department will conduct PART analyses of all programs.

The Department bases these measures on programs that are reviewed by the Office of Management and Budget under PART. The Department defines effective programs as those ranked *effective*, *moderately effective*, or *adequate* through the PART process. The measure compares the effective programs to all programs that were reviewed under the process. For FY 2003, the data reflect FY 2003 appropriations and programs that had PART reviews conducted during or prior to FY 2003. FY 2004 data will reflect FY 2004 appropriations and programs that had PART reviews conducted during or prior to FY 2004. Programs that do not receive congressional appropriations and are subject to annual re-estimates are rated by PART, but excluded from the calculation for objective 6.5.2. Excluded accounts are the Federal Direct Student Loans Subsidies and Family Federal Education Loan Program and Liquidating accounts. For many programs that do not demonstrate effectiveness, the Department has not yet collected sufficient performance data. No conclusion should be drawn that programs that did not meet this standard for *effective* are ineffective.

**Target Context.** The target maintains the percentage of dollars associated with programs rated effective from baseline, while each year a significantly higher

percentage of the Department's total program portfolio is included in the analysis. Measure 6.5.1 was discontinued effective FY 2004 and is included here for reporting FY 2003 results, which were previously pending.

**Related Information.** Information about the Office of Management and Budget PART process is available at <http://www.whitehouse.gov/omb/part/>.

**Additional Information.** Data for 2004 will be available in February 2005.

In an effort to improve performance, the Department is working to gather quality performance information on Department programs for which results cannot be demonstrated at this time. We expect to see improvements in performance information over the next two years as performance measures are improved, the Department receives Consolidated State Performance Reports of elementary and secondary education data, the Performance-Based Data Management Initiative becomes operational, and the findings of program evaluations become available. In addition, the Department is implementing legislative and program administration recommendations from PART analyses.

The Department has replaced the objective 6.5.1 measure for FY 2005. The new measure aligns with goals established for the *President's Management Agenda*. Beginning in FY 2005, the Department will track the percentage of dollars associated with programs reviewed under the PART process that are rated *results not demonstrated* for more than two years.

## OBJECTIVE 6.6: FAITH-BASED AND COMMUNITY ORGANIZATIONS

**6.6.1** Number of FBCOs that receive technical assistance concerning programs amenable to their participation through the Web site, attendance at a workshop, telephonic consultation, direct meeting, or receipt of materials

Fiscal Year	Actual
2004	20,000+
We exceeded our 2004 target of 10,000.	

FBCOs = Faith-Based and Community Organizations  
This measure was first established for FY 2004.

**Source.** Department of Education, Office of the Secretary, Center for Faith-Based and Community Initiatives.

**Target Context.** Targets are based on outreach and technical assistance plans established in conjunction with the White House Center for Faith-Based and Community Initiatives.

**Additional Information.** The Center for Faith-Based and Community Initiatives provided the following technical assistance opportunities in FY 2004:

Conducted two workshops with state officials on implementing the supplemental services pilot project.

Conducted nationwide video conference in 11 locations providing technical assistance on mentoring and community technology grants.

Sent 45 e-mail blasts to database of 20,000+ contacts on funding opportunities.

Provided technical assistance, including webcast, sample quality proposal, and question-and-answer teleconference, for each program amenable to participation by faith-based and community organizations.

Met with state and local leaders of faith-based and community organization centers to boost state and local collaboration with the Department's center.

6.6.2 Percentage of programs amenable to participation by FBCOs in which novice applicant reform is implemented	
Fiscal Year	Actual
2002	62
2003	100
2004	87.5
We did not meet our 2004 target of 100.	

FBCOs = Faith-Based and Community Organizations

**Sources.** Migrant Education High School Equivalency Program (CFDA: 84.141).

Migrant Education College Assistance Program (CFDA: 84.149).

Safe and Drug Free Schools—Mentoring Programs (CFDA: 84.184).

Migrant Education—Even Start (CFDA: 84.214).

Community Technology Centers (CFDA: 84.341).

Carol M. White Physical Education Program (CFDA: 84.215F).

21st Century Community Learning Centers (CFDA: 84.287).

Adult Education and Family Literacy Act (CFDA: 84.002).

**Data Quality.** There are no data limitations.

**Target Context.** Targets developed in line with governmentwide targets.

**Related Information.** Information on initiatives of the Center for Faith-Based and Community Initiatives at the Department of Education is available at <http://www.ed.gov/faithandcommunity/>.

**Additional Information.** Novice applicant priority was implemented in seven of the eight Department programs amenable to participation by faith-based and community organizations. Novice applicant priority was not

implemented in the Safe and Drug Free Schools-Mentoring Program, where school/community-based organization partnership preference was substituted for novice priority. The Center for Faith-Based and Community Organizations at the Department will continue to work with program offices to increase awareness of novice applicant priority and will work to ensure all programs amenable to participation by faith-based and community organizations implement novice applicant reform.

6.6.3 Number of grant applications from FBCOs for federal discretionary grant programs	
Fiscal Year	Actual
2003	372
2004	Baseline + 10%.
We set a baseline in 2003. Data for 2004 are pending.	

FBCOs = Faith-Based and Community Organizations

**Source.** Department of Education, Office of the Secretary, Center for Faith-Based and Community Initiatives.

**Data Quality.** There are no data limitations.

**Target Context.** Future targets will be set based on trend data.

**Additional Information.** In FY 2003, 372 faith-based and community organizations received grants from the four Department programs amenable to participation by faith-based and community organizations.

The FY 2004 data will be available in December 2004.

6.6.4 Percentage of FBCOs that successfully apply for federal discretionary grant programs	
Fiscal Year	Actual
2003	FBCO success rate is 20%, non-FBCO success rate is 21%.
2004	Target is that the success rate of FBCOs is within 10% of non-FBCOs.
Data for 2004 are pending.	

FBCOs = Faith-Based and Community Organizations  
This measure was first established for FY 2004.

**Source.** Department of Education, Office of the Secretary, Center for Faith-Based and Community Organizations.

**Data Quality.** There are no data limitations.

**Target Context.** Target established based on the governmentwide goal to provide equal opportunity to faith-based and community organizations.

**Additional Information.** Although this performance measure was established for the first time in FY 2004, the Department calculated the success rate for faith-based and community organizations based on the FY 2003 grant cycle. The FY 2003 data indicate that the faith-based and community organization success rate is within one percentage point of the success rate of

non-faith-based and community organizations. These data demonstrate that there is equal opportunity for faith-based and community organizations in the Department's amenable discretionary grant programs.

The FY 2004 data will be available in December 2004.

6.6.5 Number of FBCOs approved by states as supplemental educational service providers under No Child Left Behind	
Fiscal Year	Actual
2004	159 (est)
We exceeded our 2004 target of 90.	

FBCOs = Faith-Based and Community Organizations  
est = estimated, preliminary, or partial data  
This measure was first established for FY 2004.

**Source.** Department of Education, Office of the Secretary, Center for Faith-Based and Community Initiatives.

**Data Quality.** Data are based on information as of September 2004.

**Target Context.** Future targets will be based on trend data.

**Additional Information.** Since January 2003, the number of faith-based and community organizations providing tutoring and other supplemental academic enrichment services under the No Child Left Behind Act has increased from 11 to 159, an increase of 1,445 percent.

## OBJECTIVE 6.7: PRESIDENT'S QUALITY AWARD

6.7.1 President's Quality Award	
Fiscal Year	Actual
2002	Applied for the award and gained insight.
2003	Applied for the award and gained insight.
2004	Target is to apply for and win the award.
Data for 2004 are pending.	

**Source.** Department of Education, Office of Management, application materials.

Office of Personnel Management (OPM).

**Data Quality.** The Office of Personnel Management reports award status. Final status of our application is not expected until after the publication of this document.

**Target Context.** The Department's targets were developed knowing that the Department would need to gain insight to the application process. The Department gained experience in the application process as a result of the FY 2002 and FY 2003 cycles and expects to submit a successful application for FY 2004.

**Additional Information.** The final status of our application will be available in December 2004.

The Department's FY 2004 application for the President's Quality Award is based on the Department's

significant progress in providing accurate, reliable, and timely financial information that is useful for assessing performance and allocating resources.